

SESSION 2, OCTOBER 26, 1989

[Tape 5, Side A] 258

Dills's forty-year legislative efforts to repeal the relative responsibility law--Dills's role in the creation of the UCLA School of Law--His participation in the Commission on Interstate Cooperation and the National Society of State Legislators--Dills's efforts in the field of driver's education in public shools--His role in passing an agricultural labor relations act in California--His collective-bargaining legislation--Expanding the role of teachers in decision-making at the school site--The benefits of teachers and parents working together--The effects of Proposition 13 on California public schools--Teacher salaries and the notion of merit-pay increases--Dills's concern that the separation of church and state be maintained.

[Tape 5, Side B] 288

How an educational voucher system would throw school districts into economic chaos--President George H. W. Bush as the "education and environmental president"--Addressing the decline of American education--Why public schools cannot do the work of the parents among students of different cultural backgrounds--The value of bilingual education--English as California's official language--What Proposition 63 meant--Hamiltonians and elitists in contemporary American society--Dills's lottery legislation--The amount of money the lottery does and does not generate for education--Dills's opposition to the expansion of gambling in the state--Dills responds to charges of vote-buying and "double-dipping"--Cyclical legislative reform movements.

[Tape 6, Side A] 320

Antecedents to the Fair Political Practices Commission--Criticism of Dills for taking large contributions from oil and liquor lobbyists--The costs of running for office and legislative salaries--Why his salary is adequate without a law practice--How legislators supplement their incomes and proposals to limited outside income--The problem of inbreeding legislative

incumbents--Proposals to limit the number of terms an incumbent can serve--The costs and importance of media for staying in office--The disadvantages that incumbents' challengers face--Without large amounts of money, a candidate has no hope of getting elected--Those who spend their own money in campaigns--How Republicans use money and absentee ballots to win elections--The selling of candidates and the pandering to ignorance--Dills's legislation creating the California Tourism Commission.

[Tape 6, Side B] 351

More on the Tourism Commission--What the linguistic and ethnic diversity of California's population portends for the state--How the quality of state legislators has improved since Dills has been in office--Dills's philosophy of government.

SESSION 3, DECEMBER 4, 1989

[Tape 7, Side A] 366

More on the differences between serving in the assembly and the senate--How Dills compares with his colleagues as a liberal--How having a foreign threat distracts attention from domestic problems--How protecting local district needs can alienate one from liberal colleagues--Local environmental concerns can work to statewide or national detriment--Environmental problems associated with the automobile--More on Dills's involvement in the establishment of the UCLA law school--Dills's legislation to repeal property tax on motion picture films--Revenues generated for public education by that legislation--Legislation to provide more public defenders.

[Tape 7, Side B] 398

More on the need for additional public defenders--His position on capital punishment--Dills's and his brother's anti-drug legislation--More on how others are credited with one's legislation--Discusses the most recent legislative session to give examples of bills changing authors--How private agencies have been recently classified as nonprofit entities and

are eligible for emergency earthquake relief--
How the eligibility threatens the separation of
church and state.

[Tape 8, Side A] 426

More on nonprofit designations--How this will
eventually open up education to a voucher
system--Dills's inheritance-tax legislation--
Legislation mandating the teaching of American
history and government in public schools--
Including the "Great Books" in liberal
education--How national priorities are
misdirected vis-à-vis the funding of educational
programs--More on criticism of Dills for his
liquor legislation--Holding on to your personal
beliefs while facing the pragmatic realities of
passing legislation--The effects of three
reapportionments on his district's boundaries--
Why he's been reelected sixteen times.

[Tape 8, Side B] 458

Reasons for Dills's success--His pride in giving
public service for fifty years.

[Session 2, October 26, 1989]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

DILLS: There was a law in the assembly that required children to pay to the extent of their ability to do so, pay to their parents moneys for their support, and this is known as the relative responsibility clause, or law. This was very . . .

VASQUEZ: What was your role in that?

DILLS: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: What was your role in that?

DILLS: My role was a repeal of it. It was there when I went up there. It was my endeavor to repeal that clause that was breaking up families.

VASQUEZ: Explain that to me.

DILLS: What actually happened was this. The elderly citizen had two children. They were grown-up, they were married, and they were working. So the social worker would go to them and find out what their income was, how much they made, and go to each of them and say, "Well, look, you're

going to have to pay one-third of this and the state will pay the other." They would split it up so that each of them would have to pay a certain amount and . . .

VASQUEZ: Towards?

DILLS: . . . and they deducted the amount from the father or the mother's check on the assumption that there was a legal requirement that the child should make the payment. Well, the child didn't make the payment and wouldn't make the payment in many instances because the child's wife objected to it. "Taking the money out of our coffers here, how are we going to support our kids?" And so on and so on. It created a family rift with a result that, in too many cases, the child, the son or the daughter, didn't pay. And so the mother or the father was deprived of that money.

VASQUEZ: What was the thinking behind this bill?

DILLS: The thinking behind it was that children are responsible for helping their parents.

VASQUEZ: And to save money for the state?

DILLS: Save money for the state.

VASQUEZ: And this was during the Depression?

DILLS: This was during the Great Depression of the thirties and forties and subsequently.

VASQUEZ: Were you successful in repealing that?

DILLS: I would get it out of the assembly each year, get it over to the senate, and the senate would kill it.

VASQUEZ: Did you pursue it when you got to the senate?

DILLS: I did, and Reagan would not sign it. It was not until Governor Jerry Brown came in. He did sign it finally, almost forty years after we first started the fight. So it was one of those long fights, and it was one of those things for which I'm very, very happy. [I] also added to it a bill this year which had to do with the question of when a person has received aid and they have a home. The state can move against the estate of the person who had been receiving aid, and in some instances, require the heirs to sell the parent's home if they don't have other resources to pay back the money that was spent on the parent, because they had a lien on the homes.

My bill says that even if they're not actually relatives but they have taken care of that person, then they can come and show that

they've done this for the last few years before the person died, and there will be an opportunity for them to present a claim for a waiver of the sale and a waiver of their contribution.

VASQUEZ: I see. There was something else that you were involved with, a number of things that you were involved with, that we didn't discuss when we were going over your assembly years, and that would have to do with the UCLA law school. Would you tell me your role in the founding of the UCLA law school? And some of the politics that went on behind that?

DILLS: First, you have to know that southern California did not have any public law school. Two such law schools existed in northern California: Boalt Hall School of Law and Hastings [College of the Law], through the University of California. These were public law schools supported in the budget by the state of California. When I wanted to go to law school in 1943, there was no public law school in southern California. So I had to go to a private law school, and it was a night school in

those days. Loyola Law School was the only law school that existed that was accredited, as I recall. In any event, I did go to Loyola Law School. When we came back up to the sessions This was '43 to '45.

In the 1947 session, I was chairman of the Los Angeles County delegation. We had thirty-two assembly persons and one senator. Other members of the legislature, such as [Assemblyman William H.] Bill Rosenthal and [Assemblyman Elwyn S.] Bennett and other members of the legislature, had to go to private law schools here, or had to go back up to northern California to Berkeley and so on, or to Hastings, to get the benefit of a public school tuition. At my instigation, Bill Rosenthal introduced the bill to provide for a public law school in southern California.¹ We worked it out with our Los Angeles County delegation, and southern California too, but particularly Los Angeles County. We simply said that we want a

1. A.B. 1361, 57th Leg., Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1557 (1947).

law school in southern California or there isn't going to be any budget adopted. The board of trustees. . . . The [Board of] Regents of the University [of California] had previously wanted to, and even in the special session, they wanted a college of medicine.

VASQUEZ: At UCLA?

DILLS: At UCLA. They didn't get it in the special session until 1947. They objected to our asking for a law school.

VASQUEZ: What was the basis of their objection? Do you remember?

DILLS: Well, they said, "We can't get a law school at this time. Our priorities are for the medical school. And then later on, perhaps, the law school. But our priorities are for a medical school." So we, in substance, said, "Well, if you want your medical school badly enough, you will lay off of us, because we are not going to give you a medical school until we have our law school. It's not fair to us in southern California. We have two in the north, we have none in the south." So we said, "We will not vote for the budget." The budget had

appropriations in it for Boalt Hall. It had appropriations for Hastings. It had appropriations for every other thing of government, and it would have appropriations for the medical school too.

VASQUEZ: So you held up the university budget until such time that they conceded?

DILLS: We held up the total budget, every dime. No budget at all. We had thirty-two people.

VASQUEZ: The state budget?

DILLS: And twenty-seven can hold it up. And we did. That's the way we got it. I was the chair of the delegation that led the fight. We passed a. . . . We didn't pass the Rosenthal bill. We may have passed it then, but we didn't put it into budget then. It was put in later. We put in the medical school. It was agreed that we would put law in later, and that's the way it happened.

VASQUEZ: That's a great story. Tell me, there was another role that we did not discuss, and that was your role in the Commission on Interstate Cooperation. What was your role in that? You became president emeritus of that?

DILLS: No. The Commission on Interstate Cooperation was a legislative, statutory commission composed of five members of the assembly, five members of the senate, and then five executive officers. I think the lieutenant governor was the chair of it. Its duties were to meet with similar commissions and representatives of governments of the other states. We implemented this and financed it and put it into being. One of the committees of that commission was the Committee on Federal Relations. I was chair of that committee, as an assembly member of the commission. In connection with that, we met with the other states. We met on matters of juvenile justice. At that time, we didn't have juvenile courts. There was not the separation of the young people from the others. We also had problems with drugs in those days. We also had problems of mental health and general problems that each of the states would have, and what could we do by meeting and exchanging our views? Usually, almost always, California was a step ahead of all the other states.

VASQUEZ: Even then? Back in the forties?

DILLS: We were leaders even back then. We led the group, and the things we put in were pioneering in so many ways. As I may have mentioned, it was. . . . At one such national meeting of the Commission on Interstate Cooperation, we passed my resolution calling upon Congress to cede the tidelands to the states. And they did, subsequently, cede to the states the tidelands. The federal government under Harry Truman did not own but claimed the tidelands out to the three-mile limit. So under my leadership as chairman of the Committee of Federal Relations, we persuaded Congress to cede the tidelands. In addition to that California Commission on Interstate Cooperation, the legislators themselves organized into two different groups. There was the leaders' group, and then there was another group of which I became a member, then secretary, treasurer, vice president, and finally the last president thereof.

VASQUEZ: What was that called?

DILLS: It was called the National Society of State Legislators.

VASQUEZ: When were you its last president?

DILLS: That was in 1978, I believe. We met. . . .
There was still another council of state governments. There were three different groups then. You had the commissions. You had the council of state government.

VASQUEZ: And the National Society?

DILLS: And the National Society, the leaders' group in there in place of the commission. Anyway, there were three organizations of legislators besides the commission. We met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, in 1978. It had been agreed upon by the three of our groups that we would merge all into one, and it's now called National Conference of State Legislatures. Those of us who were leaders and officers of our respective groups Leo McCarthy, the speaker at that time, was the member from California on the leadership group. I was the member. . . . I was the president of the National Society of State Legislators. Speaker McCarthy and I were on the executive board of the new Conference of State Legislatures. That was for a two-year period of time. And then after that, one of us had to get

off according to our rules. So the speaker stayed on the executive board, and I was off.

VASQUEZ: You became an emeritus?

DILLS: Yes, I became emeritus of my group--the National Society of State Legislators.

VASQUEZ: Yeah. Now tell me, in hindsight, of what value were the bodies?

DILLS: Extreme value.

VASQUEZ: Tell me. What did they serve?

DILLS: Well, probably more value to the other states than to us, because we were out in front and we were growing, as you know, and became the largest state and the largest delegation in Congress and so on. We had a very close relationship with the United States Congress, and every presidential candidate wants to be invited to our annual conference of these legislatures. Even at Albuquerque in 1978, [Governor George] Wallace was there in his wheelchair. And [United States Senator Lloyd] Bentsen was there running for president, a senator from Texas. He was, as you know, the vice presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket in 1988.

VASQUEZ: Lloyd Bentsen?

DILLS: Yes. So it was a powerful organization. Their resolutions and their lobbying, if you will, with the federal government and agencies of the federal government, for the protection of states' rights particularly, that's what it was all about. And to get as much assistance from the federal government as we could. We have a delegation back there right now. They were able to get additional monies, more than what the president was asking, for the earthquake in October 1989.

VASQUEZ: What role did the partisanship play in these bodies, or does it?

DILLS: Very little.

VASQUEZ: Very little?

DILLS: Very little. The respective legislatures would send the delegates of both parties. Republicans would become chairmen or presidents, and Democrats. . . . So it's a. . . . They moved around and worked up through the chairs.

VASQUEZ: There's another area that you've been involved with since the days of the assembly, in which you still are involved and concerned with--and

maybe you can just merge the two experiences together--and that has to do with driver's education.

DILLS: Yes. Earl Stanley was a principal author of a bill.¹ I'm not sure what year it was. It could well have been 1947, but it was a bill that provided for penalty assessments on traffic fines. Penalty assessments were put into a driver's education fund--in order to establish in the various high schools in the state of California, for those districts that wished it--to provide a driver's education program. It was passed at that time, and the courts were the collection agencies. I sat as a judge and for seventeen and a half years served as a collection agent for this fund. As many as 32 to 40 millions of dollars now are collected from this fund to go into that pot.

At the end, when [we] had not used up the moneys because we were not allocating a sufficient amount of money to the schools, [and] the moneys were left in that fund at the end of

1. A.B. 23, 1949 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 2.

the fiscal year, Jerry Brown for the first time took that money out of that special fund and put it into the general fund. It was difficult, thereafter, to get a governor to sign a bill that would increase the amount of money for this driver's education.

At that time, I think it was \$60 average daily attendance [ADA] money for the whole year, \$60. We got it increased. I think it was my bill that got it increased to \$80 a month. That persisted for a while. Then the program was costing. . . . In the Los Angeles Unified School District to give the complete program, it was costing \$120 ADA. And to conduct that complete program, you had to take funds from the schools' general funds or not use the money. . . . Didn't have it, it wasn't coming down. Eighty dollars a month doesn't pay for \$120 services. You had special teachers, special equipment, automobiles, insurance, and so on.

Senator [Ed] Davis was co-author with me on a bill to increase it from \$80 to \$85. Last year, Governor Deukmejian vetoed the bill. This year we put it in, and the California Teachers

Association [CTA] were very, very helpful, and the school boards and the administrators and the Parent-Teacher Association [PTA] and everybody else got up on their hind legs because they were tired of not having a program at all, or a very bad program in the sense of not being complete. So they supported this bill, my bill. It was, I think, 1440, Senate Bill 1440.¹ That would provide for \$97 ADA instead of the \$80 that they were getting, which means anywhere from \$5 to \$7 million more to the schools, or \$17 a person. That bill was signed by the governor this year because finally it got to the point where he couldn't justify not using it for what it was intended for. He'd always say, "Well, this is general-fund money." But it was made general-fund money after they failed to fund the programs.

That was an extremely important bill to the public schools, to PTA, and to the young people in the state. Because, as you know, being a

1. S.B. 1440, 1989-1990 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 924 (1989).

parent, one of the things that these young people. . . . They look forward to being the age of sixteen so that they can get a driver's license and also get insurance when they do get the driver's license. Some insurance companies now will give them a deduction if they have passed the driver's test and taken the courses.

VASQUEZ: Over the years, how do you assess the driver's education programs in California?

DILLS: Well, I think it's done a remarkable job of teaching them driving skills, teaching them how to operate a motor vehicle, teaching them how to do defensive driving and all of those things that are necessary to make a good driver out of them. It cut down on the speeding and the wrecks and so on. It has made a big difference. Otherwise, the insurance people would not give them that deduction. They have found that those that have had it are less involved in accidents. So that's a good dollar reason.

VASQUEZ: Yes, it is. Yes, it is. Let's go onto. . . . We've pretty much exhausted the assembly years. Let's go onto the senate years.

DILLS: All right.

VASQUEZ: We had talked earlier about your first term, 1966 to 1970. In fact, we were dealing with your second or third term, 1974 to 1978. We had gone over your campaign against Mr. Pauley. You have been active in a number of. . . . Hold on. In 1975 and '76 session, you were active in the passing of an important farm labor act [Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975]¹ here in California. Tell me about that.

DILLS: That was a measure that would set up a farm labor board. It was sponsored by the administration. I supported it and have subsequently supported it, and have had opportunities to vote on the appointees of the respective governors since that was put in, which would be both Brown and Deukmejian. I was not the lead author of that.

VASQUEZ: No, you were not. But did you know any of the background and [the] role of [any of the] assemblymen like Richard [J.] Alatorre? And

1. A.B. 1, S.B. 1, 1975-1976 Third Ex. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1 (1975).

some of the tension that existed between him and the governor around this bill? Do you know any of that background? What's your understanding of it?

DILLS: I can't tell you that I knew about it. I really don't. I do know that both Alatorre and [Assemblyman Art] Torres and some of the other Hispanics were concerned that the board not be stacked against the workers. That's been a big fight. César Chávez and his union [United Farm Workers Union] [were having] a tough time [surviving]. They were growing, and as a result of the passage of this bill, why, they got more influence and power, and deservedly so, as far as I am concerned, because I supported all branches of organized labor that were brought forward by the workers themselves.

VASQUEZ: In another area, more than one person called you "Mr. Collective Bargaining," I know. There was another bill, and that is S.B. 275, which had to do with [the] public employees' right to strike. Am I phrasing it correctly?

DILLS: Well, I don't recall . . .

VASQUEZ: I'm sorry. That's my mistake. A right of

collective bargaining, not a right to strike, of public employees.

DILLS: Yes, I was the lead author on it. I'm not sure if it was 275. I don't remember the numbers. But I was the lead author on the measure to establish what was known as the state employee/employer collective bargaining act, and subsequently was renamed by the legislature the Ralph C. Dills Act,¹ which gave collective bargaining rights to state employees. We had previously, in other bills which I supported, given such rights. Under the Rodda bill² to teachers, not the non-certificated but to the certificated, the teachers. . . . We'd given such rights to city and county employees--local, political subdivisions--under what was known as the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act,³ which was a rewrite of the Dills-Moscone Act. It went over

1. S.B. 839, 1977-1978 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1159 (1977).

2. S.B. 160, 1975-1976 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 961 (1976).

3. Cal. Govt. Code § 3500 et seq. (1968).

to the assembly, but those rights were given to local governments and to the teachers and so. . . . My major [concern] had to do with state employees, whether they were employees at the university or employees in forestry or whatever. That was a landmark measure so far as state employees are concerned.

VASQUEZ: What were you . . . ?

DILLS: There was no right to strike in those bills. I subsequently put in, oh, many times, measures--three or four times--measures to permit compulsory arbitration as a way to prevent strikes. No one. . . . I do not like public employees striking. They don't want to strike. But whenever there is an impasse, you have no way to go. Then they go out as pickets. There's only one group in the state that has a legal right according to the court decisions and the statute, and that's the state firefighters. Firefighters do have the right to strike. They are the only group of public employees that I know of that has that statutorily. But compulsory arbitration I then thought, and still do think, is the one way that

you can go. Each year I've had, and other people have had this year, bills to permit it, and as a way to prevent strikes by severe punishment against the worker and against the employer, too, if they force it.

VASQUEZ: Some union members feel that that strangles their ultimate weapon, which is the strike.

DILLS: I understand. But if you have a binding, last-best offer, each one puts in the last-best offer and they have agreed upon an arbitrator, they have to show that the money in their last-best offer is there to pay for the last-best offer from the sources of revenue. Then the arbitrator can pick one or the other of those two last-best offers. He can't arbitrarily say, "You people, city council, you don't have anything to say about this. I'm making this decision." No, it's made on the basis of the last-best offer of either side, and depending upon the facts of the business--whether or not it can be paid for, whether or not it's fair--he makes a selection. That's the thing that the city councils and boards of supervisors don't approve of, because they want to be the last

arbitrators, and they can and do refuse to meet with employees anymore.

VASQUEZ: In this last year, we had a pretty contentious teachers strike.

DILLS: Yes, sir.

VASQUEZ: That went down . . .

DILLS: We're having them in Sacramento almost yearly.

VASQUEZ: It went beyond salary. It went to questions of governance. As an ex-teacher, what is your assessment of that? Are teachers unfairly locked out of having a say of how schools are run and how education is carried out?

DILLS: They not only are, but as a result of the [recent] strike of [the] Los Angeles Unified School District, that was one of the issues that was settled. They do now have school-site participation in the decisions. That was a very important issue. Sometimes that's the only one. Other strikes. . . . For instance, in the Compton area, it wasn't over money, wages, or salary. It was security. Their cars were being burned, their tires ripped off, and they were being attacked, and so on and so on. They wanted more security to their person and to

their property. So these strikes are not necessarily over money. It's always there, but there are other things that go into it.

Whenever either side refuses to come to an agreement on it, why, then you have to call in outsiders. They feel at times [that] they have to go on strike. It's not legal, but . . .

VASQUEZ: Do you feel that sometimes teachers unions, for example, are forced into a position like that?

DILLS: I think so, if there's no way to go except to have a strike in the sense of putting pickets out there and also not going to the job. Then you bring the parents in and you bring the public in and let them take a look and see who is right or who is wrong.

VASQUEZ: Teachers seem to feel that in the last two instances, that part of the solution is the fact for teachers and parents to unite in some kind of associative meetings, some kind of consultation. Do you think that is a good step?

DILLS: That is a very good step, and that was one of the things that I mentioned. Local parent . . .

VASQUEZ: Councils?

DILLS: Local councils, school-district councils, where

the parents and the teachers as well as the administration sit down and work out for their respective schools the things that are keeping them apart. When it's all said and done, you need two things at a school. You need students, first of all, and then you need some teachers there. You do need some janitors, yes. They're important, too, custodians and so on, very important, the other school employees. But without a teacher and a student, you don't have a school. The parents are very much involved and want to be involved in it, but in that connection, I would like to say I am not for these bills. There are about five of them that were put in this year to give so-called "parents' choice." [They] let the parents determine what school district their child can go into, [and] you will have a runaway school system that way. You will have them. . . . If they are in a school district, say [the] Los Angeles Unified School District, and Santa Monica is right next to them and having more wealth in terms of property values there . . .

VASQUEZ: This has happened in Sierra Madre [Unified

School District].

DILLS: This happens all over. They will go over. . . . They will send their kids over. . . . Get a residence established over there, and the kids You'll cream the crop. You'll do an elitist sort of thing and you'll leave, particularly, the minorities over here where there's not much money to carry on the programs that they should be carrying on. We do not have equalization for education. We do not have any follow-up on the court decision that says . . .

VASQUEZ: Serrano v. Priest?¹

DILLS: Serrano v. Priest. That is not happening because of the intense growth and so on, and for other reasons. Of course, the Jarvis Proposition 13 just ruined public schools. It's taken billions of dollars away from public schools and other public city and county agencies. It froze the tax rate, and it froze it for Standard Oil Refineries, too, you see. How often do you sell a Standard Oil Refinery? You sell your house, well, then you lose that

1. Serrano v. Priest, 483 P.2d 1241, 1244 (Cal. 1971).

tax break, the people who buy it. But if you stay in your house, your property, why then you have it. You don't sell the big industry. You don't sell the big plant, you don't sell a General Motors plant. So they keep that low. I had a bill¹ in, a constitutional amendment to change that, what we called a "split roll." In other words, have the industry, the business, pay on the basis of the value of their property each year, the assessed value of it, and not being frozen in on the 1978 rate, which Jarvis did.

VASQUEZ: We just experienced a strike at the Beverly Hills School District. Part of the complaint that they have there is salaries, and rates of salaries compared to the kinds of salaries that administrators of the district get. What's your reaction to that? Do you think that the administrators get too much money?

DILLS: That is a current problem, and I do not know the specifics of that particular district. We have

1. S.C.A. 5, 1979-1980 Reg. Sess. (1979).

1,006 school districts in the state of California. So I'm not informed well enough to determine whether that's bona fide. I know that in the Los Angeles Unified School District thing, why, they pointed out the great number of administrators, how many there were compared to the number of teachers, and what huge salaries they were getting and how many of them were getting those huge salaries. Whether the total amount of money in that was all that much, I don't know. So I would rather not try and say [that] what is happening in Beverly Hills is an appropriate thing. I do think that there is an overstaffing. I do think that there are too many in administration and not enough in the classroom.

VASQUEZ: Do you agree that the teachers . . . ?

DILLS: I don't know whether or not it is a very significant money issue.

VASQUEZ: Do you agree that across the board, teachers are not paid enough?

DILLS: I certainly do.

VASQUEZ: What kinds of legislation have you put forth to remedy that?

DILLS: Well, I. . . . We put in minimum salaries in the constitutional amendment. We've put in ratios between teachers and administrators, bills to cut down on the number of administrators per teacher. We put in measures that will increase the basic salaries of teachers. We've put in programs to provide for mentor teachers and get a little more money than the others, all sorts of ways to go. But basically, if the money isn't there, you can't get it.

VASQUEZ: What is your feeling about this notion of merit pay increases for teachers? It's been around, it got a lot of circulation during the Reagan administration, that teachers should be paid on a merit basis.

DILLS: Well, it's interesting thing that they would bring up those goodie ideas like that. I assume that all teachers have a certain amount of merit, and their subject matters and so on, but how can you pay teachers on the merit basis when they're being stolen away from schools by high tech and the Silicon Valley? Particularly your science and your math teachers. Do you pay them more than you pay a history teacher? And why?

Is it more important to train kids to go work for Silicon Valley than it is to train a person to be a good citizen? [To] know something about history and government and how to conduct himself as a human being, rather than to be a productive worker for some big outfit? I don't know what you mean by merit system. I assume that they will set up their own ideas of who is to determine who is the best teacher and that sort of thing. It has something to recommend it. We put in a program whereby we had teachers get additional funds for helping other teachers, and that was put in the Hughes-Hart bill.¹ But when it is all said and done, you can play around with gimmicks, but if you do not fund it, if you do not have enough money [to] back the school kids because of property tax--the Jarvis thing--also the [Paul] Gann limits on schools,² if you've got them in a straitjacket and the money isn't coming in. . . . You can have all

1. A.B. 1725, 1987-1988 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 973 (1988).

2. Proposition 4 (November 1979).

the beautiful plans for awarding merit teachers and all those good things and have your magnet schools where they can go and get specialized training and so on, but how do you really provide enough funds for all of the kids and all of the teachers? That's the issue.

VASQUEZ: What other education-related work in the senate would you like to develop here?

DILLS: I am one of the most outspoken persons on the question of separation of church and state. I feel that it is the most dangerous thing that we can do for churches, in particular, to have government telling the churches how to run the church. If the church gets into the school business and they want money from government, then they're going to have to accept government's regulations. If we adopt a voucher plan for that matter, the beginning of the voucher plan, it's a parental choice, parents' choice, of selecting whatever district that they want to go in. We're developing an elitist system. We're working against American public education available for everybody regardless of his cultural background, racial background,

financial or economic condition. That's not American. That is un-American, in my opinion, to conduct schools in that fashion or to permit public funds to be taken and put over here in a parochial school. Or a private school for that matter.

VASQUEZ: And this is in. . . . Going back to segregation? Is that what we're doing?

DILLS: It will segregate by withdrawing them, those that can afford to go over there, and take the money with. . . . And if this money, the ADA money, the average daily attendance money, the public money, follows the child over here, then you can never plan your year's program in the public school. How many are going to leave?

[End Tape 5, Side A]

[Begin Tape 5, Side B]

DILLS: How do you know which teachers you will rehire at the end of the previous school year? Give them a contract the next year? Bus drivers, how many buses? The whole thing. You cannot plan a budget when you don't know how many people are coming.

VASQUEZ: [Then this] would put the system into chaos?

DILLS: It just puts the system in chaos. You got it exactly right. They're in bad enough shape now because we in the legislature, we sometimes even go past the July deadline in passing the budget.¹ They have to pass their budgets in August. So they don't know how. . . . And your school is out in August. It is out in July. It used to be March 15 when they tell you whether or not you're coming back the next year as a teacher. Maybe it's put over now, I don't know. But they have to look a year ahead of time. "Are we going to keep you here? Are we going to make you a probationary teacher? Are we going to make you a tenured teacher? We don't know if we don't know how many people we're going to have, and so on and so on, whether or not we have the money to pay for you." So it's a very, very bad thing in my opinion.

Now, it is supported by too many churches. I can only say to them, I said it to

1. The state budget deadline is June 15 and the new annual budget goes into effect on July 1.

a man who was in here just a few minutes ago, that once the church starts relying upon the government, then they can and will get a Khomeini. They can get what they have in Russia. So you can get hurt by the state trampling on the church. You can get hurt by the church trampling on the state, but more likely the church is going to get hurt in most places.

VASQUEZ: But in either case, it sounds like you're saying education gets hurt.

DILLS: In either case. And we have that First Amendment, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or prohibiting freedom of speech, of the press, of the right of the people peaceably to assemble them, to protect. . . . And so on. You start messing with that separation of church and state, you're in big trouble. That is going to be an issue shortly in the question of child care centers.

VASQUEZ: What do you anticipate that. . . . President George Bush claims that he wants to be the "education president." What do you expect this

administration would do in either one of those cases?

DILLS: I expect the usual big joke.

VASQUEZ: Explain that to me.

DILLS: Well, he wants to be the education president, but he doesn't want to support the schools. He wants the local governments to support the schools. And he's not willing to give the money. He cut back even on his promises. He will promise you a lot of things. He wants to be the education president. He wants to be the environment president, doesn't he? He didn't rush very quickly up to Alaska over the oil spill. Maybe I am making a political speech here I shouldn't be making, but you asked the question.

VASQUEZ: Uh-huh. [Affirmative]

DILLS: I have not seen him very anxious to pick up the tab for these things that he wants to do. No, you can't solve the school problem, education, illiteracy, and so on, by throwing money at it. You can solve the savings and loan, however, by throwing money at them at public expense. It's going to cost every taxpayer here

many, many hundreds of dollars before this is over well into the multibillions. That's throwing money, our money, at somebody, people who ought to be prosecuted.

VASQUEZ: There have not been any prosecutions . . .

DILLS: And this government ought to be prosecuted for permitting it to happen, but that is another story.

VASQUEZ: Right.

DILLS: He wanted to be the environmental [president]? Well, great! What's he done about that? He wouldn't even go up to Alaska and inspect it, and didn't do much about it, and hasn't done much about it since. He didn't rush down to Hugo.

VASQUEZ: Hurricane Hugo in . . .

DILLS: Hurricane Hugo. He finally sent Quayle out here for our earthquake, and he got out here and ran around and said he's going to do something about it. Well, we'll see. He signed a bill yesterday, or today, that's giving us something. But it was under pressure. Well, there was a bill that was signed. I think we get \$3.5 billion.

VASQUEZ: Oh, yes, right. Emergency assistance for the earthquake.

DILLS: For assistance for the earthquake, yeah. The earthquake in particular. I see the demise of our public schools if we go into that direction of public funds for sectarian purposes. I have vigorously won a lot of enemies by doing it, but I can't help it. It's too important.

VASQUEZ: Recently there was a study made of college graduates in the United States, and it really was quite depressing. Most college graduates confused the Communist Manifesto with the Constitution of the United States. They cannot tell you who wrote The Republic. They have no idea who fought in the Civil War. What are the remedies to this? You say it isn't money.

DILLS: First of all, let me make it clear that my principal interest in being in the legislature is to protect and preserve and expand our public school system, to make available to every child or adult who wants to take advantage of [an] elementary, high school, college, or university course, or pursuit, that they are able to do so, and not at such an expense that they're unable

to do so. Thereby, we need money. Yes, we have to throw money at that, if that's what throwing money means to those that use that as an excuse.

We have to go back a bit to the fact that ours is the one and the only nation of any consequence that has such an ambition to make it possible for every kid to go as far as he wants to go. That's what we should continue to do. No other nation has done it. No other nation has as many language and cultural differences and deviations as we have. No other country tried to do it on the scale that we're trying to do it.

There is no other country like ours. So we cannot compare us with Japan or anyplace else. Those who do not like what we're doing in the public schools and want to turn it over to private schools, or churches, or parochial schools, are just using that as an argument and pointing out as Reagan did, as Deukmejian does, as Bush does, as everybody does, how well the Orientals are doing over here and over there. Well, they are also . . .

VASQUEZ: But they are also in the public schools. Why

are they doing well and others not? I think you had an answer to that, yes?

DILLS: I have an answer to that. I gave it yesterday. There is a family, and a culture, and a background, that's the difference. If you have only one parent in a family, and that parent is working, and that parent has just enough money, maybe enough money, to keep them fed with whatever kind of food they can buy on the kind of budgets that they get and what they're working for on the minimum wages, that sort of thing. . . . You cannot supply kids with simple things like enough food, nutrition, that they can come in there and feel like. . . . When your stomach is working on you, grinding you, and you don't have anything down there, you don't think very well. If you're hungry and if your body is not very strong, you cannot take too much either.

Beyond that is the fact that we have all of these cultures here. We have all of these languages here. As a teacher, I know, and I am sure that you know. . . . You made mention yesterday, as I recall, of the number of

students from foreign lands or [speak] foreign language in the classes that you teach or have taught. In Japan, they have the one language. They have one set of characters that the children learn before they ever go to school. So they already know how to read when they come to school. They have longer hours, they have the one culture, they have discipline at home. And they are taught that if you don't do well, then you disgrace us and yourself and you get hari-kari, you know.

We don't have that here. We are a melting pot, if you please. And we are taking in, in particular in the state of California, we are getting the boat people from all over. People whose lives are endangered. In my senate district are the largest number of Cambodians in all of the United States. Of course, we all know Mexico and South America and Vietnam and all over, everyone comes here and we accept them. They are a part of us. We want to make them American citizens, but we won't give enough money to even have bilingual teachers there.

Sure, you can peel off the smart ones or

the ones that have had the discipline at home, or for other reasons, have been able to stay in school and to learn and didn't have to work after school.

We cannot expect our public schools to do the work of the church or the work of the family--the fathers, the mothers, the parents, or the older children. We can only have them do what they can do. And we cannot take over parenting, totally, and insist upon discipline when there's no discipline at home. Those are just beginnings.

It was the labor unions in this country that first started, and insisted upon, public education. We've had to fight, fight, and fight to get bonds or taxes passed in order to get money for schools. Whenever we have, as we have right here in California today, history books that are talking about the forty-eight states; whenever we have science books that say, "Sometime we may put a man on the moon. . . ." They are in the books. They are there today, if they are not all torn up. You can't take them home, because if you do, they're so old and so on that

you don't have a textbook. We don't have enough textbooks. We don't have enough seats. We are number fifty, number fifty in the amount of income that we put per person into our schools! We are fiftieth, the very low . . .

VASQUEZ: We used to be very high in that category.

DILLS: We used to be number six and so on.

VASQUEZ: What happened?

DILLS: Jarvis happened, Gann happened, and Reagan and Deukmejian happened. They cut back, cut back, cut back: "Get government off our back."

VASQUEZ: Are priorities misplaced do you think?

DILLS: Absolutely.

VASQUEZ: What is your position on the continuing, smoldering debate on bilingual education? Do you feel that it is un-American somehow? Or somehow undermines the unity of the country? Or do you see it as a vehicle that could be used for integrating people to . . . ?

DILLS: The latter is of course what it is designed for, and what it is doing. Tell me how in the world you can talk to an Hispanic or a Chinese if you can't understand what they say and they can't understand what you [say]? There is no communi-

cation if you can't communicate linguistically. It just won't happen. I know from [the] experience of my family. My wife is Chinese. She was born in America. Her niece came over from [the] People's Republic of China, and she had had some English there. But when she came over here and she went to Sierra [Community] College, which is a community college in northern California, she had the highest grade points of any of the students. Her daddy was a professor over there and was one of those that [they] kicked out of college when they closed them under the cultural revolution and so on, and [he] literally pulled a plough.

Anyway, she took English as a second language. She had some there, but she took English as a second language. If she hadn't had a little bit of English over there, she would have [had] a very difficult time here when you get into the sciences, when you get into history, when you get into literature and so on. Only example that I know of personally. And it is because of the discipline in the family that she did it, and her intent and

desire to go, and the availability of someone there who could communicate with her.

There is a need for many, many more bilingual teachers. We can't supply them fast enough, and there is not enough money to do so if we wanted to. In my opinion, this business of "English only" is a parochial, ignorant sort of a thing to do. It just boggles your mind. "You wave the flag around America. You speak English or you're not an American. Everything should be in English."

VASQUEZ: React to this, if you will. The Mexican novelist and writer and ambassador Carlos Fuentes says in a televised debate with Bill Moyers: "The fact that Proposition 65¹ had to be put on the California ballot urging that English be the official language only indicates that English is no longer the official language." How do you respond to that?

DILLS: Well, I can't conclude that that's the case. I don't follow such reasoning. English is the official language.

1. Proposition 65 (November 1987).

VASQUEZ: Official in what sense?

DILLS: In a sense that it's used in our schools, it's used in our government, it's used in our laws, it's used. . . . There it is. Whenever there are 5 percent of the community that are Chinese or Hispanics, Mexicans or whatever, then we can have ballots and have other documents, as well as instructions for driver education, in the other language. It's utterly stupid to expect a person who has just come in here from Vietnam to be able to read in English the driver requirements and pass the examination in English. They have to learn English somehow and in some way. It's a lot like the question of the salute to the flag, or prayer in school. It's one of those jingo, one of those separative, one of those conservative, one of those reactionary, one of those "Leave us alone" kind of a mentality that isn't American at all.

It isn't America at all. America is not a one-something anything. It is a multi-everything. That's the greatness of us. If all of my brothers and I were the same, why, I would never have gone to college, or all of us would

have gone to college. It isn't that way. My brothers are dissimilar to me in so many different ways that. . . . Same parents, I know they're the same parents. I know my parents. We do not expect everybody to be of one mind: "Do it this way or it can't be done any other way."

VASQUEZ: Why did Proposition 65 . . . ?

DILLS: What was it, 200 years [before] finally they said, "Well, Galileo, you're right. We're wrong." I mean, how long does it take?

VASQUEZ: Why did Proposition 65 pass two to one? And what does that portend for us?

DILLS: It portends that there is this parochialism, provincialism, this "me-too-ism," of a generation of people who want to build a wall between them and the rest of society. Because they have it made. They are the real ones, they make the money, they have the power and, "We are the only ones that are on the right side with God," or some supreme being. "We're the only ones that really know how to take care of things. See what we've done? Look at all the money we've made. Look at the position of power

we got. Look at the kind of dinner we can give Forbes magazine. Look at us. This is America." That's the real quill.

It's that type of mentality that wants to strut around and show off that kind of, really, ignorance, when you come right down to it. They are as, quote, "un-Christian" as any group of people I've ever known. They wouldn't recognize the man Jesus, or wouldn't accept him. "He's a homeless fellow, huh?" Did he care about money? No. We got too many Judases among those people. We've got one of them who got two million dollars for going over and denigrating the office of the president of the United States.

VASQUEZ: Who are you referring to? The ex-president?

DILLS: I am referring to . . .

VASQUEZ: Reagan going to Japan and being paid a handsome [sum for a] speaking tour?

DILLS: Yes, I am. Exactly.

VASQUEZ: Going to England and accepting an aristocratic order?

DILLS: Exactly. Because he has been, and is, an elitist. And that's what they are building.

Maybe they want the aristocracy. Maybe they want what Plato thought was the best way to go. I don't. And the French Revolution didn't want it. And the American Revolution, although we were not. . . . The American Revolution, the people who were in that were pretty aristocratic in the sense of a popular people. But the ideas that were in there were for everybody. Although they themselves, the Thomas Jeffersons and the Adams and so on . . .

VASQUEZ: Especially the Hamiltonians.

DILLS: Paine. . . . Huh?

VASQUEZ: Especially the Hamiltonians.

DILLS: Yup. So I don't know whether that's enough . . .

VASQUEZ: It gives one a sense of what your feeling is about education.

Let me go onto another piece of legislation, another aspect to this concern that you've had consistently for education. That has to do with our state lottery, which was sold, I think in large part, to the California public as a vehicle for providing the educational system with more funds. You seem to feel that, in fact, not enough of the lottery dollars go into

the educational system. I believe in 1985, I'm sorry, '85-'86 session, you introduced S.B. 333,¹ which would address that. Can you give me your interpretation of those events?

DILLS: The lottery was a fraud, is a fraud. It was designed to make money for the Bally Corporation, which owns Scientific Games [Inc.]. It was financed with \$2 or \$3 million by them. They used that carrot in front of the donkey, that it was going to serve education. Education was going to be serviced very well. This gave those who wanted to gamble anyway a rationalization, you see. They could rationalize turning the state of California into a gambling institution for the first time. This means that the state is officially in the gambling business. I don't like that, and it should never have happened. It hadn't happened before, and I was opposed then to the lottery and I am opposed to it now. And I wish it were repealed, but it will never be, because too many

1. S.B. 333, 1985-1986 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1517 (1985).

people got too many things, and the schools now have been bought so far as that particular issue is concerned. There are too many people out there that are getting a few bucks out of it, and are constituents of it.

VASQUEZ: Do you think the educational system has become dependent on it?

DILLS: The bill. . . . Senate Bill 333 that you mentioned was a bill that says this: "Look, before we had a lottery, we had all of these education bills here that said we shall send down so much money ADA, we shall pay so much money for the gifted and talented, we should pay so much for the disabled, we shall pay so much for transportation, so much money for this, so much. . . ." We had the bills there that we were to allocate these funds in accordance with these things that we said they should do. We are to pay for them in the state. The California State Lottery Act of 1984 says this money "shall not be used as substitute funds but rather shall supplement. . . ." ¹ I predicted then, and my

1. Proposition 37 (November 1984).

predictions unfortunately have come true, that all it will do is to lead the people to the belief that so much money is coming into the schools from this that they will say, "Why do we need any more bond issues? Why do we need any more taxes? We don't need that anymore. Look what the lottery is doing."

Well, the lottery funds that come in now, they only get 34 percent. The lottery fund doesn't pay more than 3 percent of the total cost of K-12, no more than 3 percent. This Senate Bill 333 says, "This is what we were obligated to do before the lottery was ever formed." Therefore, that's the base. Therefore, anything that comes along hereafter starts with this as the base, on top of this. But this governor, Deukmejian, has cut back on our schools and the amount of money that got into the budgets, an amount of money that comes in from the lottery. So we haven't earned a dime. It hasn't increased the amount of money for schools a dime.

VASQUEZ: You anticipated this would happen?

DILLS: I anticipated that, and that is exactly what's

happened. Now, so far as the lottery is concerned, it also was so written that only the Scientific Games, the people who produced it, were the ones who could, and did, bid on carrying it out.

VASQUEZ: Who benefited from that?

DILLS: Only they, they were the only ones.

VASQUEZ: No one in the legislature?

DILLS: They print the tickets, they. . . . Nobody. Nobody. We have our Lottery Commission that's supposed to run the show, but their hands are tied because nobody could bid. Because they wrote the specifications so that only they could do so. No others could actually get in there and be accepted. So Senate Bill 34 and then Senate Bill 35,¹ my bills, provided for competitive bidding. Those two bills made it possible for us to make competitive bidding on the printing of the tickets and the servicing. That has saved from the first two years, saved I am told, over \$10 million for schools, those two

1. S.B. 34, 1985-1986 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 55 (1986); S.B. 35, 1985-1986 Reg. Sess. (1986).

bills.

The base, of course, of Senate Bill 333 says, "From where you start when you supplement." The problem is they're not supplementing, they're just supplanting, taking the place of. And we are right back. . . . We are in worse condition than we were before, because we now have the public opinion that we don't need the money. You see the millions of dollars have come down quarterly. That sounds like a lot of money, and it is. Three-hundred and twenty million, whatever it is. Maybe a billion dollars a year that comes to the schools. Well, what does it cost . . ? That, as I have said is only. . . . It's no more than 3 percent of the cost.

VASQUEZ: You have a very strong sentiment about gambling, yet you've been criticized as a senator for being very close to gambling and liquor and horse-racing interests, and in fact, Gardena is one of the few places in California where legalized gambling exists. What's your response to that?

DILLS: My response to that is that legalized gambling

came to Gardena before I was ever in the legislature, and it isn't only in Gardena. It came to California [with] the Gold Rush, and we have over 400 poker parlors, card clubs, in the state of California today. And they didn't all start in Gardena. A few of them started in San Francisco, Sacramento, and all. But the larger ones, yes, in Gardena, the larger ones [are] there because of the quirk in the law that the penal code section. . . . I don't know the penal section number. It says that it is illegal to play fan-tan, pharaoh, blackjack, and so on, and stud poker. It's what the law said. It didn't say it was illegal to play draw poker. So they started here in Gardena draw poker, low ball, and so on. In other words, no up cards. I don't know much about that. If I did, maybe I wouldn't lose so much money when I play with my brothers. [Laughter] But anyhow, the courts said, "Well, if the legislature had intended to outlaw draw poker, they would have mentioned it in here." There's a Latin expression [that says] if you name all of these things and you forget to name one of them, then this one was

not intended! I could quote it at one time.

Anyway, so the supreme court said, "Well, it's not illegal to play draw poker." So it's legal. Not by statute. It is legal because the legislature didn't say it was illegal. They didn't name it as such. All right. Since that time, with the influx of the Orientals into California, there are grown-up games here that are not mentioned in there at all. They call them pai-gaw or pai-goo, whichever, and they have other Chinese and Oriental games. The Chinese people [for] a thousand years have gambled and will be gambling for a long time, as will others.

So they opened up in Gardena and other places, and big parlors now outside Gardena. In fact, we've closed. . . . We only have three We only have two poker clubs down in Gardena. The three of them are going by the board, because the big ones opened up in Bell Gardens, city of Commerce, and other places. Multimillion-dollar ones over there. We didn't serve any liquor here in Gardena until those opened up and so on. I am not trying to defend

gambling. It was there before I was in the legislature. I didn't have anything to do with it. I paid no attention to them, never been, never played a game there. It didn't matter.

I was opposed to the lottery. I'm opposed to bills of Assemblyman Floyd. In fact, I was talking on [it] just now before you came in. Some fellow from the Los Angeles Times wanted to know what I thought about the proposals of Dick Floyd to have bookmaking legal, bookmaking on sporting events legal. I said to him what I would say to anybody else, any other place. I was opposed to the lottery for the first time the state of California got into the business of gambling. We have a state commission, the California Lottery Commission, now. The legislators--I call us our board of directors because we confirm the commission--I don't want to be on the board of directors of a gambling establishment. If I did, I'd have tried to get in on one of the poker clubs here. But no, thank you.

I'm opposed to the extension of bingo. I was opposed to it, and still am, for the reason

that the people don't get the money. They had a big scandal in Sacramento County where they got no more than 10 percent of the proceeds from the bingo game. It went to the promoters. They were not supposed to be in there at all, no salaries for any promoters at all. Only security people could be paid. It made no difference. It's a scandal, but it is there.

VASQUEZ: Do you see it expanding in the future? We've had a recent case in which one of the owners of one of the local clubs here has run for mayor of Cathedral City with the intent of putting . . .

DILLS: Yeah, locals in.

VASQUEZ: . . . in large gambling establishments.

DILLS: It didn't happen there. It didn't happen there.

VASQUEZ: What does that portend? Do you think people will not accept it? Or do you think that . . . ?

DILLS: In that community, in Cathedral City, they don't want it there. They don't need it there. Those people there don't want it, that's all it says. A local option. They voted in, voted out. Same here in Gardena.

VASQUEZ: Do you foresee people trying to expand gambling?

DILLS: Definitely, of course. Of course. There are

those in the legislature, since I've been there, that want to have the same gambling games as they have in Nevada, wide open. "Why send the money to Nevada?" is their answer. I'm against that. Gambling is no way to support government authority or government policies and programs. That is no way to support it, no way to finance it. It's wrong. If it is police, fire, streets, roads, whatever, pay a tax for that. Everybody pays a tax. We don't need people messing around, skimming off money, getting criminals into it and so on. If we are going to be able to keep criminals out of the lottery, we are going to be lucky.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you [about] another criticism, or negative statements that have been made, to give you an opportunity to put your view on the record. In 1979, you were investigated by the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation] along with Senator Randolph Collier and James Wedworth and James Whetmore of La Habra about what was called then "vote-buying."¹ Tell me about that

1. "Dills, Three Ex-Senators Probed by FBI, Paper Says," Los Angeles Times, January 13, 1979, I, p. 3.

incident and what the outcome was.

DILLS: Well, I haven't had any idea where they got the idea that we were buying or selling votes. As a matter of fact, I've forgotten what the bill was that they referenced to. Is there any more . . . ?

VASQUEZ: Yes, let me give you a summary.

[Interruption]

VASQUEZ: Go ahead. We were talking about the FBI probe in 1979.

DILLS: Oh, yes. Well, I don't recall the so-called legislation or the vote-buying incident, except that I do recall that I was not brought before the grand jury. I don't know the outcome of any of this, whether or not Senator Song or anyone else was. I don't recall the issues. You've read to me a newspaper report there that said it had to do with rent control. I'm not sure how I even voted on the thing. I don't think that I prevented. . . . I really don't know what happened in connection with it, but I surely know [that] nobody by the name of Brown or anybody else offered me any, or did I take any, or did I know of any money that was offered for a vote on that or any other bill.

VASQUEZ: In an August 1983 article of the California Journal,¹ Jackson Rannells lists you as what is known in the literature as a double-dipper or a triple-dipper. In this case, he argues that you make quite a living off the state, that in addition to your \$28,000 a year salary then, you got \$43,000 a year annual pension from the judges retirement system, and that you got \$1,590 a year from the state retirement system as a result of being a teacher in Compton. Is that a fair attack or criticism to make of the legislators?

DILLS: Well, of course, having been considered as unfair that I should be the recipient of an earned retirement is difficult for me to understand. How that can be unfair to anybody, my having put the money into the system and [having] put in the number of years as a teacher that permit me to get what I now get, \$147 a month. That's not state money. That's money that I put into it, and the state matched it, of

1. Jackson Rannells, California Journal, August, 1983, p. 285.

course.

When I arrived at age sixty, I was able to then receive my judicial retirement from my twenty years of service when I tacked on some of my assembly onto the. . . . I took, I think, a year and a half or two years from my assembly time and tacked it onto the judicial time, which is legal and permissible. And in 1970, I was able to start drawing my judicial retirement. I thought! I applied for it. Then, for the first time, I became aware of a little-known bill. This bill says that any retired judge who receives [a salary] in any public office, either by appointment or by election, that the salary for that public office shall be taken out of that judge's retirement pay.

Now, I was a state senator, elected as a state senator, serving as a state senator, from 1967 to 1970, receiving my state senate salary. When I retired as a judge in 1970--because I reached age sixty at the time--then this law became effective, and my entire senate salary was taken out of my judicial retirement, and I did not get it back until 1983. For

thirteen years, I served as a senator without pay. If that's double-dipping, baby, make the most of it. I'd love to be able to double-dip like that. However, the point is I had earned my judicial retirement. It had nothing at all to do with the senate. I could have retired as a senator because I had twenty years in there, too. I would have had by staying on a few more years in the seat. Well, let's see. . . . I had ten and a half years. I borrowed two years and a half. I had eight years from the assembly, and I needed twelve years in the senate, then I could retire at that time, full salary. Or I could retire with three-quarters salary at the age of fifty, after fifteen years of service. So yes, I am getting now. . . . Because it was 1983 before the legislature had courage enough around there to pass the bill to say that's not fair. This man, another judge, Mayor [Lionel J.] Wilson of Oakland, the very same mayor who is there now and who is a retired judge, he never got his salary as a mayor. Because up until the time this bill was passed which repealed that law. . . .

I don't know who put the bill in. I don't know who put it in. I used to blame Jesse Unruh because he didn't like a certain retired judge who was giving him a bad time, and he came up to the legislature. I don't know. He denies it, but I don't know. But I do know that for a period of thirteen years, I did not get my senate salary.

When I arrived at age sixty-five, I had social security coming because I'd paid into it. I was entitled to it. I had a vested interest into it, and I take it. So, yes, I was triple-dipping. I was getting that magnificent sum of, it wasn't even \$147 at that time. From there, I think I get about \$286 social security. Then I get my judicial retirement. I'm a triple-dipper today. And if I were to retire tomorrow, not work in the senate and get out of there, I would be a quadruple-dipper, because I've been in public office for fifty years, and I've worked at each one of the jobs. I've earned my money there, I've done my job there. I have a vested interest in it and, yes, I will take it. I am being a triple-

dipper, a quadruple-dipper if I ever decide to retire from the senate.

VASQUEZ: This, maybe, can take us into a topic that I wanted to pursue, and that has to do with the apparently cyclical, but now very, very much before us, concern for legislative reform. As you know, in the last year there have been a series of FBI stings¹ in Sacramento which has led to the indictment of at least one senator and potentially others. You've been in the state legislature now for many, many years. Has the role of money and politics in California begun to corrupt the institutions?

[End Tape 5, Side B]

[Begin Tape 6, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Go ahead.

DILLS: I don't know that I'm in the position to pontificate on this subject. This would assume that I know more than I do know about the exchange of money for votes. I don't know anyone who has exchanged money for votes. I

1. From 1988 and into 1990 the FBI conducted a number of elaborate investigations into influence peddling and corruption by California legislators.

don't know of any vote-buying. I read the papers. I don't know. I know that I have not participated in it. I know that it is being perceived as more prevalent as a political situation that exists with us.

I do know that in the days of [Governor] Hiram W. Johnson, when the railroads were around and everything, that he and the other progressives at the time put through the initiative, the referendum measures, to let the people do some legislating. I know that he set up what was then known as the Railway Commission, now PUC [Public Utilities Commission], in order to keep the railroads from running the rates up high and giving favors to the legislators and buying legislators. That's what they said in those days. I've read some of the reports of what took place before I got there, the Philbrick Report and other reports of money being exchanged for votes, or contributions being given, which in those days didn't have to be reported.

The reforms that are coming along, the Fair Political Practices Commission and others that

have come along, so far as I'm concerned, have bettered the situation somewhat. But they haven't, if there was that danger, they haven't done away with it for the reason that what they have done is to give legislators a hit list. They take a look at what some PAC [political action committee] has given to some other guy and say, "Hey, what's wrong with me?" That situation exists, of course. I don't know whether or not this is an actual fact, but I think in so far as legislative offices are concerned, the race that I was in in 1974 . . .

VASQUEZ: Against Pauley?

DILLS: Pauley against me, yes, and another fellow that ran second. There was more money spent in that campaign than any other campaign for the legislature previously. And that, in my opinion, kind of started the big money thing. When we had to file the economic reports as a result of what the legislature did. . . .

Let's not forget that the Dymally-Moscone [Act] was the first, so-called, economic-interest thing. Then they came along to put it into an initiative act. The FPPC thing grew out

of a good thing by the then secretary of state, one Edmund G. Brown, Jr., who used it very effectively in getting himself elected governor and running against the legislature. As I said earlier, apparently some public relations people think that it's a good thing to do for candidates who are running for governor now.

I have voted for public financing of campaigns. It's not the best way to go, but it's better than the way we're going now. I would be tickled to death if I didn't have to take a dime from anybody. But I don't. . . . When I'm in the office and I want to run for the office. . . . And I did run for it. I will take contributions from people if they understand that I am going to vote the way my district and I feel should be voted.

I will vote sometimes for things that [make] people say, "Well, you're just in the pockets of the oil industry." But they don't recognize the fact that if you're a representative, you have to represent the people in your district, the industries, the people, and so on. I'm not saying that because I have a

high concentration of refineries, distillers, and so on in my district, that I should turn over my vote to the oil companies. I don't think that, and I don't do that. But I also don't think that they ought to be punished for things that they may not have had anything to do with. My people in my district work there, they have jobs there. I don't want to throw them out of business either. So I had. . . . It's a question of trying to truly represent your district.

VASQUEZ: You've been criticized for [taking] large contributions from the liquor lobbies, specifically beer lobbying.

DILLS: Yeah, I have had substantial contributions from them, because I think theirs is a legitimate business. I think they have a right to be in the business, and until the people start prohibition again, then they're legal. And just because it's liquor, and just because it's tobacco, or just because it's gambling clubs and card clubs. . . . I didn't start it. It's there, and it's there because the people obviously want it. The way they voted for this

dastardly lottery thing. But it's there. And so I've tried to make the best of it. I think that if we protect the small businessman against the chains and the internationals and all, why, we are doing the very, very best that I can for my mom-and-pop in the small stores and so on. There's where my interest is.

Now, the beer wholesalers don't care to whom they sell. But they would like a fair playing field, you see. The chains can use. . . . By doing away with fair trades, they can use their own brands as "loss leaders" and take advantages of . . .

VASQUEZ: So you see yourself . . . ?

DILLS: But regulation of liquor was there before I ever went there. So I vote my district. I vote my conscience on those things. It's not the fact that they give me campaign contributions that [is] changing my mind.

VASQUEZ: But you're concerned that there be fair competition in business, is that it?

DILLS: That's right. Also, we have little guys to look after. The big guys can take care of themselves.

VASQUEZ: Getting back to this question of how much it costs to run for office now and how rapidly that seems to be escalating, there's a proposal that at least one group, California Common Cause, has made. That is to raise the salaries of legislators and strictly limit things like honoraria, and limit also the amount they can spend on any campaign, and also do away with this yearly ability to raise money, even when they are running for office, and make it limited only to those years when there is a campaign. What is your assessment of that?

DILLS: Well, that's what exists today now. This present day. I cannot accept any money under FPPC, Fair Political Practices Commission. I can't accept any money or any office. I have not been able to accept any since October 3. If I wanted to have a fund-raiser, I had to have it before October 3. Then I had to declare the office for which I was going to run and the year I was going to run.

I have an annual birthday dinner in a country club in Sacramento. I have it on President's Day, because Lincoln and Washington

and I were born about the same day. We have a holiday, and that's the only day that this Del Paso Country Club is open--the only one that can have that for any night during the year. The governor has tried to get it, and that's the only and the one night, as I was their first. I had one this year. I had an end of the session cocktail party. That was in August. Those are the ones that. . . . I have two of them a year.

I raise money for my campaigns on off years, too. But since FPPC came in, they came down with a rule that you cannot have any fundraiser except before this particular date. Of course, some of us already had these planned when they came down with the rule. So they put it forward to October 3, the courts did. Because there were two things on the ballot that are. . . . One of them passed, and the other didn't pass. They tried to meld those two initiative acts together. It's been creating confusion all over the lot, and all sorts of losses, and [we're] still going at it. So I signed that I was running again for reelection as senator in the Thirtieth District in 1990. I

cannot raise any money until January 1 of next year. If someone wanted to give me a check today, both they and I would be in violation if I took it and they gave it.

I have no quarrel with that at all. I really don't want to try and raise money, but I don't set up the rules, as I said previously. I think they were pretty well set up from 1974 on, so far as the legislature is concerned. We had special elections, as you know, in one of the districts here, in which our Democratic caucus spent over a million dollars for one job, just for a six-month period of time, or a year period of time. We had to do it all over again, over a million dollars, two million dollars. I paid into that and other campaigns over \$125,000 of my funds. I wasn't running in those districts. I turned the money over to those candidates who were running, because that's what was happening in both parties in both houses.

I don't like that way of doing business. But if you're in the fight, and it's the Marquis of Queensberry rules, or catch as catch can, or do whatever you want to do, you'd better follow

the rules, because the other guy is not going to. If he doesn't, why, you're dead. It's a sad thing, that a job that gets. . . . I guess now we're getting \$40,000. We will have a raise coming if we are reelected. We'll get 10 percent afterwards, after the two years that we could only increase ours by 5 percent a year. So we'll get an increase in December of next year, starting December of next year if I am re-elected. But at that time, I think we'll get \$44,000, something like that, a 10 percent increase. Okay, that is not a lot of money, but it is fine. It's enough for me.

I have not practiced law. I could have practiced law whenever I left the bench in 1967. I haven't opened a law office. I've had many offers to go with law firms, or start my own law firm and put in junior partners. Just my name. They'll do the work. I'll just get the business in. I declined doing that. I won't do it.

VASQUEZ: Why?

DILLS: For two reasons. I'm getting enough money from the legislature to take care of my needs. With

the salary plus the per diems plus the emoluments of the office--the automobile, which I pay half and so on and so on--those things, I don't. . . . I didn't enter it for the money. Quite obviously, as you remember, I left a job. I ran for a job. The job that I left was paying \$23,500 at the time. The job that I was seeking was paying \$6,000, but it went up to \$16,000 with the passage of Proposition 1. But I still went from \$23,500 to \$16,000. My wife said, "You're crazy." And I said, "You're right." But that's it!

VASQUEZ: What about this idea of limiting or disallowing honoraria and substantially raising the salary? Because while it may be fine in your case, for many people with children that are having to maintain two homes, it's virtually impossible. And to keep up the kind of life-style that is expected, I suppose, of a public servant. They find it next to impossible to survive on that. Is that . . . ?

DILLS: Well, I have the same problems as they have. You know, I have to maintain two homes also. Fortunately, I don't have a big family to

support now, although I did support step-children, but now I don't. It isn't that I couldn't use more money. That's not the point. The point is that I have this double-dipping that you're talking about here. I have my judicial salary now, and I anticipated that, don't you know. So I could do without more money, because I am getting it from that source. It is tough.

It is tough if that's the only source of income you have, which is why most of them have another. They have insurance business, they have real estate business, they have contracting business, they have all sorts of businesses. They talk about citizen legislators? What do they think these people are? Non-citizens? Reagan started that business of citizenry. He was just a "B" actor and a part-time labor leader, so-called. There's a lot of myth and fancy involved in the purity of so-called citizen legislators. That gets into the question that I assume you're going to talk about, the cloning of staff people.

VASQUEZ: You anticipated that well, yes.

DILLS: Yeah. In that connection, who am I to say that an American citizen, man or woman, who is able enough to persuade some public officeholder to give him or her a job, and they do the job and they learn what the work is, and if there is a vacancy [that] occurs, that that person should not be able to run for that office? That the public doesn't have a right to kick him out or kick him in, or kick her out or kick her in? Why should I take them to myself? I'm not in the supreme position to be able to say that the people of any district, the Sixty-seventh [Assembly] District where Dick Floyd ran for and was elected to the assembly, and where others who were staff members have run for various offices and won. . . .

Mas Fukai is a city councilman here in the city of Gardena. He is the chief deputy for [Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenneth] Kenny Hahn. Mas Fukai is running for reelection and one of these days may want to run for senate or assembly or any number of things. He talked about it four years ago. I don't know any reason why the people should not have an

opportunity to vote for someone who has been an aide.

VASQUEZ: I think that the concern and the argument that's made and the fears that are there are the following: that you get a person who becomes an intern, who becomes an aide, who becomes then an incumbent's candidate. And given the high cost of running for office, and given the fund-raising that takes place, that he or she has an inordinate advantage in raising the necessary money only because of their contacts already in the legislature. And that also, they may not really have a base anywhere. They may not be familiar with that community because they've been in Sacramento for any number of years. And that what you've got is you've got basically the cloning of incumbents and not a true representation of what is out there in the community to serve in the legislature. You get in-breeding, I think it has been called.

DILLS: Well, assume that all those bad things are true. Who am I to say that the people can't make that selection? It's only the guy that gets beat that's yelling that. Unfair

advantage? Is it an unfair advantage to know how to operate in the legislature? That's what they're training him for. If he knows. . . . If Assemblyman [Richard] Katz or Senator [Bill] Lockyer here who was an assemblyman, who was an aid to another assemblyman. . . . We have many of them in the senate as well as many of them in the assembly, as you know, who have been aides, who know as much about legislation and legislating in the public positions and so on. They learned about them there.

It is not necessarily true that you can pick up a businessman, an insurance man, a real estate man, [or] a lawyer down here and make of him a citizen legislator who is going to be able to know how to represent his district on subjects from A, avocados, to Z, whatever that is, zoning. The list of subjects which we deal with in this empire, that's California. It calls for a pretty broad person to just have an inkling of these various subject matters. To say that a person who has been there and as an aide has been dealing with it and listening to the public and writing letters and answering

telephones and making speeches and doing those things and analyzing bills and meeting with executives, that that person, somehow or another, because he has an advantage in knowing these things, that he therefore is to be disqualified doesn't make any sense to me. But most particularly, it doesn't make any sense to me to say that, "Well, he's got an unfair advantage over me."

VASQUEZ: I think it has to do with the network of fund-raising. And it has to do with the concern that in the last few elections you're getting a 98 percent return of incumbents.

DILLS: Well, that assumes that that's bad. The person who thinks it's bad is the one who wants your job. The guy who's on the outs. He thinks it's bad. But he would do the same damned thing if he were there to protect his . . .

VASQUEZ: Another element . . .

DILLS: As I said before, I didn't set the rules up so far as getting money is concerned. I think I had for my four years, whenever Pauley ran against me, I think I had a total of \$98,000, and I had to accumulate it. I didn't have

\$90,000 that year, because I didn't anticipate somebody's spending upwards of \$300,000 against me.

So it may not necessarily be the question of fund-raising, although obviously the incumbents have an advantage. But until the public is willing to do as they are supposed to have done with reference to the federal, the presidency, you know, they. . . . We could check off, and the president has so much money he can get. That didn't prevent Reagan from setting up fifteen independent groups that say that we're not controlled by his committee. They'd push the money in, and they'd go ahead and buy the radio time and the TV time and the billboards and the newspapers and all that sort of a thing. And he doesn't know anything about it. Big deal, huh? As if he didn't know anything about it. They know exactly everything.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you about another facet to this question, and that is proposals that have been put forward occasionally to limit the number of terms that a person can serve in the legislature. What is your response to that?

DILLS: My response to that is that that is another non-incumbent's cry, and it is one of those things that one of the candidates is talking about that I don't care for. There was no limitation upon Deukmejian, for instance, running for the assembly, running for the senate, running for attorney general, running for governor. You were limited to eight years in each one of those, or can you run for another thing? You know, what harm does it do for a person to be an expert and get seniority and learn his way around and get some power and influence? What harm does it do to your district to be in that position? What did they send you up there for? To represent them, and to be able to do some things.

VASQUEZ: Do you think then that if these people were to fall under the control or under the influence of special interests, the voters have the wherewithal to remove them?

DILLS: They've had sixteen times to get rid of me if they'd wanted to. They're going to get another chance next year. If they don't get it right then, that's their own damned fault. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Media, and playing to the media, and needing the media for election, for projection, and for visibility: that is a reality we face today, and one that seems to play an ever greater role in our form of politics. To you, what's the good, and what's the bad in that?

DILLS: Well, you've asked before concerning the amount of money that has to be raised, particularly in a statewide race, or in a congressional race in perhaps some of the smaller states, or even for the assembly and the senate in northern California, where they have local radio and TV stations that are just right for their own area. That costs a lot of money. You can't get TV time for a senator down here. It is worthless. We have how many stations around here? I don't know. Twelve, thirteen? You can't buy that. You've got to be running for a statewide office, or a countywide office anyway, before you can afford it. It's too expensive. Radio is the same thing. Your newspaper ads, they've quadrupled the charges for space an inch. It would cost you yea many bucks when it cost you half a cent or so, half that much or

quarter that much, if you just run a normal ad. But political ads are just out of sight.

Who requires all this money? The media! Uncle Sam does. We've got twenty-five-cent stamps. It costs you between. . . . To send out one mailing, if you don't use the first-class, one mailing with the printing and everything is anywhere from \$12,000 to \$15,000. One mailing, just one mailing! How do you get to the people? I understand that nonincumbents are handicapped by not having the money. I was a nonincumbent, too, at one time. I don't. . . . The national picture is. . . . The presidential thing is completely out of. . . . It's just out of sight. There's just unlimited money there for the presidential candidates. Even Dukakis was never short of money. I don't know if Dukakis was ever short of money.

VASQUEZ: But's it reached to the local level. I think Tom Bradley spent something like four million dollars raised out of state running for mayor of Los Angeles.

DILLS: He spent it out of state? Or got it from out of state?

VASQUEZ: Raised it out of state.

DILLS: To raise money?

VASQUEZ: Right.

DILLS: Oh, okay. All right, I hear you now. That's the money-raising aspect, yeah. Well, I guess the answer is if you can't afford to pay for repairs on it, don't buy a Lincoln.

VASQUEZ: So then poor or moderate-income people have no business in politics is what you're saying?

DILLS: I'm simply saying that's the rule now. If you can't afford to run for it. . . . You surely should not use your own money, because that means then only the wealthy can run. If there are any limitations or restrictions that you ought to put on, that would be one that you should put them on.

VASQUEZ: Which is?

DILLS: Because other. . . . If you're going to limit how much the guy who isn't a multimillionaire, a millionaire. . . . How many millionaires do we have in the U.S. Senate? About a third of them, I think.

VASQUEZ: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. [Affirmative]

DILLS: About a third of them. We have some

millionaires in our legislature. One of them is up for trial now for forging Ronald Reagan's name on a letter, against Dick Floyd.

VASQUEZ: [Assemblyman John R.] Lewis?

DILLS: Lewis, yes. He's a millionaire. I don't know whether he is guilty. . . .¹ I know that somebody did it, because I received copies of it. I don't know whether he is the one that did it. Let the court decide that. But no, I'm not recommending that people not run for the office. I didn't establish the rules. It was not that way when I ran for office, but it's getting that way now that I couldn't win again probably. Maybe I could without spending a dime. Maybe I could! My name. . . . It depends on the guy who's there running against me.

But if the opposite party, the Republican party, believed that I wasn't going to spend a dime or any of this money that I took in, or didn't take in any money, they would do to me what they did to [Senator] Arlen Gregorio, who

1. Charged with illegally and fraudulently using the signature and photograph of then President Ronald Reagan on an endorsement mailer.

said he would not take any more than a \$50 contribution. So he wound up being ex-senator. Al Rodda didn't take any money of any consequence, didn't spend any money, and he lost after twenty years there. Unbelievable! Nobody believed that. It happened. [Senator John] Doolittle went after him in the last two weeks. He went on TV. They did everything that you need to do: spend the money, get the publicity. They ran him down and they tied him in with some other person with a similar name. I'm not going to get into that.

VASQUEZ: So the long and short of it is, unless you have money or can attract large money, it's hopeless for you to be a candidate in politics in this country now?

DILLS: Unless. . . . Well, yes, it's probably the same thing. I was going to say unless you have connections through your work in the legislature or somebody else as a staff member or as a lobbyist or something.

Tim Leslie, [an] assemblyman up there, was a lobbyist for the League of Cities. Your

cities, and your counties, and your school districts, all public agencies. They have lobbyists up there all over the lot. They pay them. They're not supposed to contribute, however, to campaigns, but they're around and they talk. They know whenever you can do something for the city of blank, or you won't do anything for the city of blank. They let that be known, city councils, boards of supervisors.

I had a very interesting thing in Paramount city last campaign, three years ago. They called me over there and asked if I would come over to one of their city council meetings. I got over there, and they wanted me to be there by the time they opened. They opened, and the first order of business was they had me come forward and they presented me with a resolution commending me for the work I had done; [work] that brought to Paramount a redevelopment program that has completely changed that community, absolutely. I got a new city now as a result of the redevelopment bill that I got through. I forgot to mention that, but now that you mention these things, it's recalled to my

mind. In this resolution in a public meeting, they endorsed me for reelection. That had never happened to me before and it will probably never happen again. But that was their way of saying, "You've done a good job for Paramount, and we want everybody to know it. We are four Republicans and one Democrat on our council." Okay.

I can't help it if I do a good job, and people such as they support me without money. Because their support is money in the campaign. It is goodwill. It's letting people know, "Here's a man that's looking after our interests." No other city in the state was able to do what I was able to do there--I was able to let them do there. That's to use the money from the redevelopment agency, outside the area of the redevelopment agency to build roads, sewers, sidewalks, and housing. Housing for people with limited means. Okay. Yeah, I take money that is offered to me for the campaign. I don't have to vote for them, and I don't vote for them if I don't believe in them. But if they contribute to my campaign. . . . Many times I don't even

know who it is. They have an ABC group, or good government group, or some American liberty group, or whatever it is. They send the money to my treasurer and we put it in the kitty. I don't ask them for it. I send out invitations to fund-raisers. They don't want to come, they don't have to come. I never call them. I never put any squeeze on them. I never call them up or threaten to vote for them or not vote for them or whatever. So they do it . . .

VASQUEZ: What reforms would you like to see? What additional reforms would you like to see implemented in California's legislature? Whether it has to do with the amount of money we spend on . . .

DILLS: I wish it were possible for us to limit the amount of money, I mean really limit the amount of money that can be spent in campaigns, and then have that money come from the public so that a person . . .

VASQUEZ: An even playing field.

DILLS: Even playing field. And not let anybody spend any of his own money, or any outside independent thing, claiming they don't know what it's all

about. Because Reagan and his crowd just absolutely. . . . We thought there was a good law there, but they started on independent groups and this committee and that committee and this PAC and so on.

VASQUEZ: The Republicans argue that because there is such an ordinate Democratic registration over the amount of Republican registration that the field would not be even. That they would be at a decided disadvantage if we went to this system of limiting the amount of money.

DILLS: Well, that is too bad, isn't it? It's changing, however. It's changing. The Republicans are very, very close in getting. . . . In closer and closer . . .

VASQUEZ: In registration?

DILLS: In registration. They're registering more than we are. They're paying more money for each vote, sometimes five dollars a person. They are spending a lot of money out there re-registering people. They have perfected the absentee-ballot thing, which is the way Deukmejian beat Bradley. Bradley was elected on Sunday, but Tuesday, whenever the absentee ballots came in,

10 percent of the votes came from absentee ballots. That's the way Deukmejian won. They perfected that. They send out the absentee ballot to the people and encourage them to use absentee ballots, which is not supposed to be done, but they do it. They have them send them back to the headquarters so that they make it back. If they don't come back, they'll go out and call them, bring them back in here, and they'll collect them there. They'll know who's voted, and they'll send them in to the registrar. If these people don't vote, why, they go out there and get them, send that thing in.

VASQUEZ: Why don't the Democrats do that?

DILLS: They don't have the money. We don't have the money to do it. We're not organized. Remember what Will Rogers said? "I am not a member of an organized party. I'm a Democrat." [Laughter] Yes, I would like to see the reforms so that it would not be necessary. I don't particularly relish the fact. I take advantage of it, but as I said, I didn't start this. I didn't set the rules up. I didn't have the money. It has come

along, and the ones with the money are most likely to get the attention. We are selling candidates. We're selling candidates like we're selling soap or any other product. We appeal to people's greed, we appeal to their emotions, we appeal to their racial hatred, we appeal to their ignorance, and we elect a president based not on issues, based not on anything but pure unadulterated--I'm trying to tone it down a bit--prostitution of people's feelings.

VASQUEZ: Example?

DILLS: Example: Willie Horton. Example: flag salute bill. Example: gun control bill. Example: blacks versus whites, southern states. Example: non-Christians, not saved. Want some more examples? Selling prejudice. You're selling and pandering to ignorance, religious and racial and cultural. . . . What's the word? Prejudices? Prejudices, racially and otherwise. It's pure ignorance. It has to be taught. Children are not born with prejudices, race, color, and anything else, religion, anything. They play with. . . . They enjoy each other, or they fight with each other, regardless

of the race or the color, even the language they. . . . They have their own words. They have to be taught to hate people. Love isn't taught nearly so much as hate. Yes, we need a lot of love.

VASQUEZ: In 1985, you authored this S.B. 653,¹ which [strengthened] the California Tourism Commission. What was your thinking behind that? And how effective do you think that commission has been?

DILLS: Let me point out that I was the principal author on it, the lead author on it, but it was actually authored by four of us, each of whom had a committee that affected tourism. There were two assembly persons. There was [Sam] Farr and [Lucy] Killea. Then there was Senator [John] Seymour and I. Each had a part of the business of tourism. So it was decided that we would merge and meld all of these into one bill, and since I was. . . . I had the first bill on the subject, I think. I was asked to be the

1. S.B. 653, 1985-1986 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 750 (1985).

lead author, but it was a total of the four committee chairs that went on that bill. So I didn't do it by myself, although I was the lead author on it. The tourism industry has been kind enough to call me the father of tourism, but I wanted to spread the good word around to the others who did participate in it. We were able to get, I think, \$5 million put into the budget at that time. Subsequently, we had a good fight because that was something that the governor wanted, and he appointed the commission. They did, and have done, a good job. We've been able to secure statewide cooperation, and we've set the state of California into twelve different Californias. It's a beautiful PR thing, and it has worked very, very well. We can say to people, "Do you want to see California? Well, we have twelve of them. We have the deserts, we have the mountains, we have the oceans, we have the big trees, we have Central Valley." And they're set up into twelve different districts. Each of those districts is given a particular play and appeals to the constituencies of the world.

[End Tape 6, Side A]

[Begin Tape 6, Side B]

DILLS: We had broken the state of California into twelve Californias. There's the big woods area. There's the desert area. There's the ocean. There's the north, the south, the central, in which we feature the outstanding portions of those twelve Californias, and we're telling the world about it. We have, oh, many hundreds of Japanese who come to northern California, to the big woods, the trees, that sort of thing. We have. . . . Literally, as you know, we have Disneyland and others, so that we are truly an empire. California is truly an empire we've divided into twelve sections in order that people can have twelve different vacations if they wish it that way. We received the cooperation of the hotels and motel business, the airlines, the bus, the trains, and all of those that can and do profit from people coming in--[people] who will spend seven times as much money as we have put into it. We raised seven dollars for every one dollar that we spend for tourism. It's an issue each time. The

governor likes it. The Democrats know that he likes it, and he has cut some of their programs. So they try to cut that one down to make a compromise. We've had to do that this year. I find myself at odds with our Democratic leadership on that because I don't think we ought to do that sort of thing. It works out, and we get more money this year than we did last year. It's a good program. It pays for itself. Okay. I think we've got it.

VASQUEZ: Now, given the diversity, the linguistic and the ethnic diversity that is growing in California, do you see that as a good or a bad thing? And what do you think that portends for the future of California politics?

DILLS: I think it is good. I came out here from Texas, and the majority of the people here from the other states are Texans, incidentally. There are more Texans here than from any other state. That says something. It shows that there are some people in Texas that have smarts enough to come to California and stay here.

We are receiving from the Pacific area great numbers of people who are coming here,

fleeing from those tyrants and dictators and all that do not recognize any rights, or very little rights, of democracy. We are getting them, of course. They come from Central America, South America, and from Mexico. Because we need a lot of people working for us here, we've asked for them to come up and help us with our work, the hard stoop labor, the strong back work and all. And then we sometimes forget them after they've been here and the harvest is over and they have no place to go and no place to find work. Yes, we need them all, and they're welcome here, so far as I am concerned. It is a betterment for us, because they bring with them a culture, they bring with them a discipline, they bring with them a work ethic that we could stand. They are teaching us in more ways than one.

Those of us who are natives here in the USA, and those of us who have gotten into a welfare culture in which we have perhaps third-generation welfare families, have lost something so very, very valuable. Lost a family, lost a will to work, lost a work ethic, or lost an

opportunity to work. These people are bringing to us and they're giving us good examples of how things can be if families can, by all pitching in, make a go of it. We have to learn that from them. We can learn from them. We must do that. The need anymore for just brawn and labor, that kind of thing, it's periodic, it is seasonal. Now we have to teach people other skills. We have to persuade them that we can learn from these folks. Don't look upon them as competitors, but look upon them as cooperators. I am not one of those who says, "Well, we are here. We don't want anyone else in."

One of the worst groups of people among us, who do not want any more people to come in, are second-generation people. Those whose parents came here, immediate parents came here. They were raised here. Now they don't want any more people coming in to compete with them. They're almost as bad as the jingoes and the real conservatives of yore and the native Californians. I look upon this state as one in which so-called minorities will be the majority. The Hispanics, by population, will be

the majority. And they should be and will be in positions of influence and power. Their skills must be matched. They must learn more skills. They must pull themselves up. They must realize that while more than 75 percent of the jobs will be service jobs, nonetheless, in that service area there are many things that one can learn.

They can be competitive with the foreign markets and the foreign people that have outdone us because they were able to start anew, Japan and Germany being two cases. They lost the war they fought, but some people wonder who lost it. Look at them now. Where are we and where are they? But they rebuilt their structures, they rebuilt their processes. They started. . . . They took from us and they bettered ours and they started anew because theirs was destroyed. We can destroy some of our shortcomings, too. We can destroy them by upgrading them. We can destroy poor habits by adopting a little better work ethic [in] our unions and our nonunion people. We can put out just a little bit more. We could have a little more respect for ourselves and for other people. These people do

bring to us. I am happy that they're here. They bring to us possibilities of making California greater and greater than it is.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that this growing diversity will polarize politics in California?

DILLS: I am afraid it will. I hope it doesn't. I don't like to say that we ought to get ourselves at a position where we can take over in the sense of just because we are we. I say that if they have the abilities, the qualities, leadership qualities and so on, regardless of their race or their group, I know it will polarize. It has to be in a way. For instance, right now in the city of Gardena. . . .

Incidentally, I don't live in the city. I live in the Los Angeles strip, so-called. Although my mailing [address] is Gardena, I live beyond Vermont. I live in the strip between Vermont and so on. But I am a Gardenian for that. . . . But here, there was a group, Sunday mornings. Members of the black [community], or members of our clubs here, who want to divide the city of Gardena into districts instead of running at large. Well, you know, there is a

court decision recently, where . . .

VASQUEZ: Watsonville?

DILLS: Watsonville. Oh! Watsonville was one of those that was hit hard in the quake. Watsonville says that you've got to do that. And I think the supervisors and the city council are going to have to do that in various places. Fine, that is all right because that is fair. It is more fair than at large, because at large, why, they're still a minority. But in a particular given district, why, they can be a majority.

Now, as I have mentioned to you before, 38 percent Hispanics in my district. I would say, however, that the voting of that group is relatively low. While there are 20 percent blacks, there are more blacks who vote than Hispanics who vote. So many of the Hispanics are not yet citizens. They are here in numbers, but they're not citizens. So the vote is limited and restricted to the extent that they become registered and become citizens. But it's fair in my opinion that. . . . Whether citizens or not citizens, they have a right to be and should be represented because they are here.

They work here, they live here, they pay taxes here, they go to schools here, and so on.

VASQUEZ: I ask you this question because your district is especially diverse in the populations that live here, and you've represented it in one form or another for so many years. It seems to me you can address that question of whether or not growing diversity in any one city or section of the state could mean chaos in the way that some politicians in office today seem to imply. Let me ask you a question that has to do with your own institution. You have now served in elected office for fifty years. In your estimation, has the quality of public servants, but especially those people in the legislature, has the quality improved over that period of time that you've been serving?

DILLS: Without a doubt. No question in my mind at all. That is particularly true in the senate. I talked about the citizen legislator. Well, when you take a look at who were the citizens, you have lawyers and so on and so on and real estate people and big farmers and people who were parochial and provincial. They were tied

into their little world there and were not truly statewide legislators. I guess I get criticized from time to time for spending as much time as I do away from the district. An opponent uses that every time, residence every time: "I'm not here. I don't live here. I'm always in Sacramento. You're never here." The point is, you are a legislator for the whole state. Transportation is for the whole state. Schools are for the whole state. Waste, garbage, that's for the whole state. Bottles, you name it, everything is statewide. So yes, you represent your district, but you are also a representative at large.

Now, these so-called clones, these people who have been staff members and so on, without exception, every one of them is a college graduate or has had business experience in the area that brings them in as a consultant. They bring there a skill and a knowledge and a background and an education which is as good as or better than. . . . You go along the street, and there they are. You will find no more bad among them than you will find in 120 other people, be

they Rotarians or Christian ministers or whatever they are. You will find as good people there, as knowledgeable people there, or as bad people there as you will find in 120 people otherwise. I think they truly represent the people. Maybe they represent more of the Democratic people, but there are more Democratic people. Maybe they represent more of those that are without the high-economic income, and the economic positions, but that's the way most of us are in California. I certainly don't have any millionaires in my district that I know of, or any particular industry that controls the people such as the Ernie Ford [song] "Sixteen tons and what do you get?"

VASQUEZ: "Another day older and deeper in debt."

DILLS: "Another day older and deeper in debt." We don't have such. . . . We have plenty of aircraft, we have plenty of Silicon Valleys here and there. But as I see it, the legislature is as good as, or better than, the people that send them up there in the sense that they are more knowledgeable. These are smart people they are sending up there. You take these young people

in that assembly. They are young and they're rowdy and they're a little bit vulgar like younger people are, but they're sharp and they're smart. They are dedicated. They are concerned. They may not be quickly jumping in to become champions of industry, or of business and so on, but while they are there and as they are there, they are looking after the people's wishes and they're truly representing their districts. Orange County is conservative. Yes, we have a millionaire or two among them, but they are representing their district. They have a right in Orange County to have a conservative. They have a person that agrees with their philosophy. That's what it's all about. If you don't have that, you don't have true representation. I think that the legislature we have, in spite of the occasional bad boy or the guy that is too greedy or whatever, just as you'll find him in the church, you'll find him in the school, you'll find him in industry, and you'll find him in Wall Street, and you'll find him everywhere. If he is that way, he is that way in all callings. And they are everywhere,

but most of them are capable, able, competent, and are willing to and do serve well.

VASQUEZ: Tell me, as a result of being in government for so many years, what is your philosophy of government? Or what do you think is the role of government in society?

DILLS: The role of government, if I could put it in one short sentence, is to do for the people--which is the government--that which the people can't do for themselves and needs to be done. That's it. The government is not the enemy, in spite of Reagan and his philosophy. "Get the government off of my back," he says. But the government isn't on our back. We are the government. We elected him, a mistake maybe, in my opinion. We elect our congressperson. We elect our state legislators and judges and so on and so on. We get the kind of government we deserve. We deserve the man because we elected him. We are getting the results. Your kids and my kids are going to be paying off this credit-card government that we've been running. We've been running the national government on a credit-card basis. It is going to cost us twice

as much to run it on the pay-as-you-go, running it without a deficit. And those things that they have done, they have actually put the government burden onto the people instead of taking it off of the people.

Of course, they are making us pick up the cost of their manipulations in HUD [United States Department of Housing and Urban Development]. They're making us pick up the cost of their letting the S and L's, savings and loan industries, go down and bring down with them little people everywhere--to lose their homes, the whole thing--bring whole regions down with them. They have manipulated our money to the point that if a president sneezes, the stock market will drop twenty points. If a president dies or gets into trouble, what happens? Wheew! Away it goes. They have so manipulated and it is so fine-tuned anymore that you have Wall Street and the Federal Reserve Bank and all of them looking at each other. What are they going to do? What's going to happen in Japan? How is it going to affect us? What did our October [stock market] fall do here? We were

propped up, if you please, by the Japanese saying, "We have so much money invested now in the United States, we can't let it fall." So they didn't panic. Their stock market didn't go down, and the value of the dollar stayed very well. They leveled and saved Mr. Wall Street and so on. We are such a closely-knit. . . . We are being manipulated by our own government.

One of these days--this will be my closing statement I hope--one of these days the depression that has been leaning and leaning and leaning, it is going to hit us and we are going to go right down, and all of these things that we've done are going to come home and we're going to have to pay the price for them in a very, very hard way. I don't know how long it will take. I've been predicting it for three or four years, but I couldn't imagine that the people will put up with the great deficit that we have and so on. But that's the kind of government that I don't like. That is the kind I would like to get off of my back. I'd like to spend money for people, not spend money for corporations, for the military, spend money

overseas for peoples and regimes and dictators that don't deserve a dime. I would rather spend it here for schools and for hospitals and for our senior citizens and taking care of our people here. That's what government should be and is for. It's the people serving themselves in an organized fashion.

[End Tape 6, Side B]

[Session 3, December 4, 1989]

[Begin Tape 7, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Senator, in this session today, in addition to some particular questions about some of your legislation, I would like to ask some general questions about your perceptions and your experiences in the California state senate. Now, you've served in the senate since 1967, and before that you served a decade in the assembly. How do you compare now, with that period behind you, the two bodies serving in the two bodies, serving in the two bodies?

DILLS: First of all, when we were in the assembly, it was not supposed to be a full-time job. We had sessions every other year, and we had two-year budgets. So in the even-numbered years, we were not in session unless we were called by the governor to be there on a special session until the year 1948. Then we had our first annual budget session. I was on a select committee,

which was the Joint Session Budget Standing Committee, which looked over the bills that were presented to us. If it was not a bill to raise revenue or a bill that had to do with the budget or financing government, then it didn't belong in the budget session. So we culled out all the bills. Actually, it was in the 1948 session that I was able to put the two and a half million dollars into the budget which was for Long Beach State University, but I could not implement it that year. So we did it in January of 1949. That's how come they call themselves the Forty-Niners, and we had our fortieth anniversary this year.

The problems are not too dissimilar, because I was there during the Depression. Jobs and welfare and all those things were a part of it on the front end when I first went up. Then the war broke out. Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, the day of infamy, came along, and then we turned into more of a full-time session in the even-numbered years. We had a lot of innovative types of things such as the need for people to have a birth certificate.

It's a kind of an interesting story about the need for birth certificates for those who wanted jobs in the defense industry. The defense industry required them because they were in security situations. They required that you be a citizen. And most of us, including all in my family, except my youngest brother who was born here in California, none of us had a birth certificate. So in the legislature, we put through a bill which would permit a person to have one of his parents, or a parent and another older person, to certify before a notary public that they did know that this person was born.¹ My wife was a notary public.

VASQUEZ: Your first wife?

DILLS: My first wife [Effie Dills]. Her signature is on my birth certificate. You go into court, and the court hears witnesses there. I went into court and testified. I signed before her. My mother signed with another elderly lady. So my birth certificate has my wife's name on it

1. A.B. 268, 54th Leg., Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 95 (1941).

authenticating my birth.

We also set up the first child care centers. Some of the present national administration people all of a sudden discovered the need for child care centers, but it is nothing new. We've had them since the war.

VASQUEZ: This need was fomented primarily by women going into the defense industries?

DILLS: Yes. The men were going into the service. They needed women in the defense plants and the assembly lines and so on. So there was a great demand for them. A brother-in-law [James Goodman] of mine was in the Coast Guard. And they put him aboard trains, and he went back to the deep south, Mississippi and Alabama, and brought out trainloads of black people, both male and female, to come out here and work in our industries. So that was the first group of people that came in here from those deep south states along the coast. Of course, we had some "Okies" and "Arkies" and Texans like we were when we came in, but those were the first group of black people.

Since then, in 1942, February 19, President

Roosevelt issued that order to evacuate the Japanese. Why, Little Tokyo, where they lived, lots of them lived there, Little Tokyo was vacant. The black people moved into Little Tokyo there and then started coming south of there and meeting the ones that were already at Watts. Watts used to be the place where the black people of the Los Angeles area, south central, came. Those that were working for the wealthy people in Arcadia, in Pasadena, and in South Pasadena. There is a section in Pasadena now, in North Pasadena I think it is, where the blacks are. They still remain there. They were servants, chauffeurs, maids . . .

VASQUEZ: That's why that community started in Pasadena?

DILLS: Yes. Jackie Robinson is from there, yeah. I remember him well because he played on the Pasadena football team and beat the heck out of Compton--which is hard to do, because we were Rose Bowl champions for years. That took in Texas and Oklahoma schools and so on.

VASQUEZ: You were telling me about the assembly.

DILLS: The assembly was. . . . In 1940, we had a change in our speakership. Did I give you that

story? In which Gordon Garland and nine other Democrats formed a . . .

VASQUEZ: Was it the Economy Bloc?

DILLS: Economy Bloc, yes. I may have already told you that.

VASQUEZ: Yes, we talked about that.

DILLS: Gordon Garland pulled the . . . Well, it was pretty conservative, as best they could be. But a lot of the Democrats voted along with us liberals in things other than perhaps some of the way-out, wild ones, labor, pro-labor things.

VASQUEZ: See, that comes up now. This may be a good place to ask. What kind of liberal do you consider yourself? How would you compare yourself to, say, Tony Beilenson or Alan Sieroty as a liberal?

DILLS: I think that Alan Sieroty and Tony Beilenson and I are pretty much in the same category. At times I may be a little bit more to the left of them.

VASQUEZ: In issues like what?

DILLS: Well, maybe a question of separation of church and state. Also, in some--rare--but some of the civil liberties areas. Also probably in what

people would call law enforcement, because I was a judge during the Watts riots, as I have told you. And when I was elected, the people were turning away from the Edmund G. Brown type of Democrats. Obviously, they elected Reagan. The country was going conservative. I had been a judge up until that time. During those days I probably voted quite differently from Assemblyman Howard L. Berman and Alan Sieroty also in the field of punishment for crime. I went along with stiffer sentences and more days in jail and that sort of thing.

VASQUEZ: Was this a result of your own philosophy? Or reading of the public opinion of the day?

DILLS: I think that it was. . . . My experiences as a judge. . . . If it fitted giving him the maximum, I gave him the maximum, but I tried to get ahold of the whole picture before I did it. But during the Watts riots and so on, why, there was just no excuse for that. It was the greatest crime outbreak we've had in California, maybe in the whole world. It had everything: arson, murder, rape, had it all there. I was tough. An interesting thing developed out of that.

Maybe I've told you. If I didn't, I will. One of my opponents used that against me, that I was a racist, and I would give the maximum sentences. Well, I did if they deserved it. I didn't care whether they were whites, Hispanics, or Italians, or blacks, or whatever. If they were in there and were doing those things and were convicted of it, why, then they got the sentence.

VASQUEZ: Which opponent would this be? Do you remember?

DILLS: I beg your pardon?

VASQUEZ: What opponent would this be?

DILLS: Well, it would have been an attorney by the name of Dudley Gray, who is now a multimillionaire. He was a criminal attorney, and he was using that in the Watts area. When I. . . . After I was elected to the senate, I sent out a survey. The survey had to do with crime and punishment: "Do you believe in stronger sentences? How do you believe . . . ?" It was so written to determine how they felt about necessary punishment. Surprise, surprise, surprise to me and to everybody to whom I've told it. The blacks in that district, they were

for stiff sentences, these things, just overwhelmingly.

Then I understood what happened in the election. In the election, I had eight opponents, as I recall. One of them. . . . Two black men, but one of them was a former mayor of Compton--a very good friend of mine whom I put to work later on as I did Dick Floyd, who supported him--Lionel Cade. I got two times as many votes as all of my opponents combined in the Watts area. That taught me something, because they were billing me. . . . Dudley Gray was particularly billing me as being racist and so on.

VASQUEZ: What did it teach you?

DILLS: I beg your pardon?

VASQUEZ: What did that teach you?

DILLS: Well, that plus the survey. . . . I wanted to see if I was right, so I had this survey all over the district. The survey came in always stronger for stiff sentences than the Caucasians, always stronger. That taught me, and most people don't realize it, as they don't realize that most of the people on welfare are

not blacks and browns, they are whites.

VASQUEZ: That is correct.

DILLS: And most of the people on drugs are not blacks and browns, they're whites. And they're middle-class whites! They don't get caught, and they don't have to buy it on the streets. They don't get into the gun battles in the gangs. But they've got it just the same, and they are keeping the things going. But nobody is telling that story. It ought to be told. Every time I get a chance, I tell it.

Anyway, the other things in the legislature that were different. . . . Of course, there was a difference in the amount of money we spent. Nonetheless, most of the issues were still there: public schools, highways, and burgeoning population. And we were getting fairly prosperous. You see, California didn't really get into the depths of the Depression until about the year I was elected. It was bad enough in '34, '35, '36, '37, '38. But those years when I ran for office, '38, in 50 percent of the homes and houses and dwellings there was somebody on some form of public relief. Later

in my assembly session, why, things were better off. People were working. War economy built it all up.

Then, when the war was over, the people started coming to California. They'd been here in the service and they wanted to live. . . . "That is where I want to live!" They come and they live here. So we had to deal with those population growths and burgeoning needs for schools and so on. We have the same thing today. We had to put in highways. We did the old freeway system under Randy Collier, that "Old Gray Fox," and so on. We started those things by gasoline tax, diesel taxes, and so on. We, of course, didn't have the high-tech industries that we have now--the defense industries in terms of being manufacturers, the airplanes and things that we have now. California is going to feel the outgoing of Reagan and his evil empire battles. Has Bush lucked out! [Laughter] Has he lucked out!

VASQUEZ: Explain that for me.

DILLS: Well if. . . . Someone has said that if there were not a devil, Christians would have to

invent one, or somebody would have to invent the devil, because you've got to scare the devil out of people to get them to come to church and to straighten up and to fly right. So you scare them. You can't get people to vote high taxes and spend money for manufacturing tanks that won't work or potties that cost so many dollars. You can't get them to do that unless there is a terrible, terrible evil enemy going to surround us, going to get us in Vietnam, going to get us in South America, going to get us someplace, Cuba, going to get us somewhere. You have to have that evil enemy out there, see. So that buildup. . . . Since no longer Reagan and Bush, say. . . . Where we have. . . .

I thought we were going to have a peace breakout here, but peace. . . . It almost broke out, and then along came the Tian An Men Square in China. And all of a sudden, up jumped the Communist People's Republic of China again as the bad guy. While the heat was on, everybody was upset. We passed resolutions in the legislature about the bad treatment and cut-off trips that the legislators were going to take to

the People's Republic of China this year and so on. Bush, he was pointing with pride at what we've usually done, but dealing with alarm the way they were treating them over there. And then he sends [President Richard M.] Nixon over there. Nixon comes back, and Nixon tells him the way they really feel. And now he, Bush, has changed his mind about the students and is not going to give them sanctuary forever here, although he says what he proposes is the same thing. They don't think it's the same thing, and he doesn't mean the same thing. The evil empire sprung up its head there.

Then, of course, Nicaragua has been with us. And we're just about to be taken over by the Nicaraguan government. So we have to support the "freedom fighters" down there, poor damned little fifteen-year-old kids. It's just horrible. Now, oh, Panama! Oh, we've got a terrible enemy there. So we have to look after [Manuel A.] Noriega. Then El Salvador, oh boy! Do we have to do something about El Salvador now, huh? We have to pump out money to keep the dictators that are there in El

Salvador, but we can't help the freedom fighters there because they aren't "freedom fighters" there. So. . . . But the evil empire is going by the by and Congress has had enough, and while they've given too much money, the defense is going to be cut down.

California will lose a very substantial part of its 25 to 27 percent of the defense, all of the defense contracts. It is going to hit aviation, it's going to hit all over here. We are going to feel it.

VASQUEZ: Are you going to feel it in your district?

DILLS: Oh yes, you bet. My people are going to feel it because they work. You see, mine is a bedroom district mostly, although I am getting a lot of industry in here, a lot more than people realize. Nonetheless, it will hurt all of them. That's why I get a bad record among some of the environmentalists, because I don't believe in shutting down factories and going so far as to say you can't have a barbecue in your backyard and that sort of thing. I think that's just overdoing it a tiny bit. If there's a real way in which you can clean up things, make them

do it! But if you can't do it, [if it's] impossible to do, if there are no alternatives you can use, then you don't close them down because there's no alternatives.

VASQUEZ: Tell me, you were talking about environmentalists, and, yes, you do have some opponents in that community.

DILLS: Oh, yeah.

VASQUEZ: Let's focus in on one incident or one issue that was in 1972. You were accused of opposing a strong coastline commission.

DILLS: Yes, I did. I opposed that.

VASQUEZ: Why did you?

DILLS: I did it because I did not want to give to those environmentalists--and I still feel that way about them--the permission to go up and down this coast and set the boundary lines and tell everybody when and how and where he can build [a house] or build a road, or whether or not you can build so that you must reserve sight of the ocean for people and all sorts of. . . . That's the kind of government I don't like. Reagan says that he doesn't like it either, but of course, he uses it in order to do other things.

VASQUEZ: This is where you separate with somebody like Alan Sieroty, for example.

DILLS: That's right. That's correct. On environmental things, I would be opposite from him.

VASQUEZ: Is your concern for the local government? The local government is . . . ?

DILLS: The local government is. . . . They are taking away their powers. That's right. I opposed it. They set up a map, and this map constituted the boundaries. Here is the line. Here is the ocean out here. They did something I've never seen done before nor again. By reference, they included this map in the bill without putting a copy of the map in the bill. Now, how do you know where the borders are if in fact you don't have the metes and bounds? This line here, when you colored it, it was about an inch thick, showing you where the border was. Well, an inch on a statewide map can be a mile or more. So you have border problems like crazy. Then by putting the border in there, by referring to it in a bill, there are no metes and bounds. I said, "How in the world do you know how far you can go? One mile in? Or one and a half mile

in? You don't have any metes and bounds. Where do you take off when you measure?"

VASQUEZ: So your concerns were the limitations too vague?

DILLS: Exactly that. Plus giving to these people much more power than. . . . I know what they wanted to do. They wanted to stop offshore drilling, and they used that awful case, the one case off of Santa Barbara there, which was not in state waters at all. It was beyond the three-mile limit. I had in my committee about a three-day hearing on that particular issue of drilling. Had they drilled, had they been in state waters, they would have had to comply with our type of pipe we use, and the whole thing that protected We would not have had any oil spill out there, but they had it. They were further out. They did not drill, and they did not use the same technique and the same supplies and pipes and all that you would have had to if you'd built in here. Well, of course. . . . That big fight. . . . I still voted against preventing them from exploring. They don't even want them to explore to find out how much we have.

I remember whenever. . . . It was Buzz Pauley who had a petroleum company; he can go and get all the gasoline he wants. But I have to wait until the next day, or I have to wait until my even and odd license plate number comes up.

VASQUEZ: This was during the gas crunch [oil embargo, 1973]?

DILLS: That's right. There will be another one the minute that OPEC [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries] nations decide, "Why, we are going to shut off. We're going to cut back." Why, then we would like to have some oil. We'd like to have some oil.

VASQUEZ: So your concern is that the environmental movement, specifically along the coast, sometimes works in contradiction to the benefits of the state or to the interests of the people?

DILLS: That is my. . . . And to the national government and to the defense, yeah.

VASQUEZ: And to the national government.

DILLS: It is all right if you can afford to live along the coastline, Malibu or any place else, Beverly Hills or wherever you are close to. That's

fine, that's great. You have enough money to do that from some other sources. You're not working out here in a defense plant. You're not working out here in a furniture factory. You're not working in the oil fields. You're not working out where my people are working. I've got hundreds of children in my district, and old folks, too, that have never seen that ocean. They are out six miles from the ocean. They've never seen that ocean.

There was no place for them to swim for a hell of a long time. Now they've taken over and thanked them. I'm glad they did. Mexicans, Hispanics have taken over in Long Beach all the way east. Fine. I was in there just this last year. That is okay. The blacks finally went down here to Point Fermin. I was for that, but then money came in and they put in a marina there. So the minorities lost a very substantial part of their swimming and their beach. I've had a hell of a lot of fights, just that kind of a thing, but I think I represent my district.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that environmentalists then have

too narrow a base of interest? [Or] do you think that maybe their interests are not really the interests of the whole community?

DILLS: Well, of course, they are a minority. They are a minority. All of us . . .

VASQUEZ: But they argue they are trying to save the ecology of the coast for all Californians.

DILLS: Yes.

VASQUEZ: And that those who would allow special interests like the oil companies are the ones that are only looking out for minority interests.

DILLS: I understand their. . . . And I agree that we should save, reserve. I don't agree, however, that we should put out of business, or put out of prospects, a natural resource that belongs to all of us. If we need, as we may well need. . . . Until they can get enough corn to make methyl gasoline and so on, and make it where we could purchase it at a price that people can purchase it and so on, why, we are going to need oil for a long time. I just pointed out the cars that were parked along the streets outside of California State University, Dominguez Hills. I just came from there, and the parking lots were

all full. They park for. . . . They have to park at least three-quarters of a mile or a mile away, the students do. We are wedded. We are in love with the automobile, and it's here to stay. There's not much you can do.

VASQUEZ: You don't see in the future the possibility of a cheap or inexpensive rapid transit system for California?

DILLS: No, I don't see it. Several communities have turned down the tax, you know, increasing the sales tax. We had rapid transit here, the old red streetcars, Pacific Electric.

VASQUEZ: It's considered one of the best, if not the best in the country.

DILLS: That is what I. . . . That is when I went out to Sixth [Street] and Main Street, from Gardena. I got on it and went to Sixth and Main Street to the yellow streetcar there and took two different yellow streetcars and went up to North Vermont Avenue, where I went to UCLA, Southern Branch it was called at that time, the first time. But we put in a rapid transit system in part of Sacramento. They have turned down some of these tax increases in the special election over

here in Orange County and so on. It is coming, yet it isn't coming fast enough. Same way as our Century Freeway. It will be built the next century, maybe. [Laughter] I use that as a . . .

In 1965, when I was running for this office, in 1966, I pointed out that freeways will be parking lots by the time they are ready. Right over here where I live, the Harbor Freeway, they are now double-decking it as it was in Oakland--I hope not the same kind. They are going to put the public transportation upstairs. But when they get the Century Freeway done, it will be a parking lot the way it is right now.

VASQUEZ: The way most of the freeways become.

DILLS: On the freeway, yes.

VASQUEZ: Let's go over an area that we covered somewhat, but perhaps we can do a little more on it. That has to do with the recurring interest that one can trace in your career for education. Tell me more about how you came about being one of the legislative godfathers of the UCLA Law School.

DILLS: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: And the problems you have had in that process?

DILLS: As you know, I studied to be a teacher, and I eventually became a teacher. I taught at an adult school, the first teaching night school job I had. I taught in junior high school. I've taught in high school grades. Then, whenever we founded Long Beach State University, I taught one course down there in 1950, American political institutions. Then I taught a course in business law out at L.A. City College in the summertime. I represented the teachers in the southern section of the California Teachers Association, on the southern section council. I think I mentioned that before. I was elected as a teacher and became the chairman of the Education Committee the first time up there, until I lost it under the Garland regime. Kicked me out as chair, but I still remained in education.

I have been so grateful to my country, to the state of California, that it had available for me an opportunity to come out, [to] be what I am, to let me study my books and get my glasses thick and read, and to want to live a good life. [I read] all of Horatio Alger, Jr.,

and his "poor boys" and so on. I just love reading books. Knowledge. I like to learn all sorts of things. I take five different magazines. I take four daily papers. I take six or eight weekly district papers. My interest is in preserving public education in California and in the nation. It is. . . . I don't know how strong to put it. It's an overriding issue in all these things.

Just yesterday I was with the Grand Lodge of Masons, their public schools committee. I'm a consultant to two Grand Lodge committees, not only their public schools committees, but also their constitution observance committee. The Masons started public school week in California, and we're continuing it. Public schools, to me, are the last bastion. It is the last fort for democracy. If we lose it, then we lose democracy, if some evil empire or the drugs don't take it away from us. So I have a deep, heartfelt, longtime interest in public education, making it available to everybody, making it better in quality and in quantity, and making it so that every youngster or oldster who

wants to better themselves and go there, even for recreation purposes, [can] go there. But more particularly to e-duco [Latin, to educate],* to bring out [Latin, e-ducere--to bring out]* what they are. To give them the chance to know who they are and become somebody and have some self-respect. Then they'll have respect for others and learn some discipline. Books will help you. Schools can help you. I want to make those available. That's my life.

VASQUEZ: So how did you get involved in the move to create a law school at UCLA?

DILLS: That one came from my experiences of having to go to a private law school, a class "A" private law school. The only one that was open at nighttime was Loyola Law School. I went there. I told you before. I went there [for] two years time and took their final examination which they gave, a one-day examination similar to the bar. You don't know whether you answered questions in conflicts of law or a question of

* Dills added the following bracketed sections during his review of the transcript.

constitutional law or whatever it is, because you can't tell from the heading. They throw it all at you the way they do it on the three-day of the bar. We had a one-day final examination at Loyola, and if you didn't pass that, you didn't graduate. There was one assemblyman, whose name will not go into this record, who graduated from there but never could pass that comprehensive. He didn't get his degree, and he didn't pass the bar either, although he took it. They let him take it many times. He didn't pass.

Okay, northern California had Hastings, and then they had Boalt Hall at the University of California, Berkeley, two public schools of law. South of the Tehachapies, none, zero. Dills has to go to a private law school. So others from southern California, Los Angeles County in particular. . . . Now, Judge Bill Rosenthal. . . . I don't know. Is Bill still alive?

VASQUEZ: Yes, he is, but he's not well.

DILLS: Bill Rosenthal and I got to talking about it. We said, "We've got to do something about

this." So Bill Rosenthal put in. . . . Bill Rosenthal was the author of the bill. I, however, was chairman of the Los Angeles County delegation. We had thirty-two assemblymen and one senator. As chairman of it, I got our delegation together, and we had enough votes to stop the budget. Twenty-seven will do it. The assembly and fifty-four in the. . . . Twenty-seven will do it in the assembly, yeah. So we said, "We want a law school at UCLA." Oh, Assemblyman [Philip M.] Davis. Davis represented UCLA out on the new campus.

Oh, no. The regents wanted a school of medicine, a school of medicine. "Well, that is fine. We want a school of law." The regents got together and said, "We just can't." "Well, do you really want your school of medicine?" "Yes, we do." "Well, we want a school of law. Now we're going to sit here on this budget and nobody is going to get a dime. Not Berkeley, not Hastings, no hospitals, no nothing is going to get a dime until we get an agreement that we will have a law school. It's long overdue. So you people at Hastings, northern California, go

ahead and try to run over us." Well, we had them. We held the budget up until we got the agreement. We agreed that. . . . We let them go ahead first with the medical school, but we would put monies into the subsequent budgets. We got the law school in that way.

VASQUEZ: What broke the impasse? Just that pressure?

DILLS: That did it. We did it. We just sat there.

VASQUEZ: So your biggest opponents were the regents themselves?

DILLS: Oh, sure.

VASQUEZ: Some of the other law schools?

DILLS: Of course. The governor, too.

VASQUEZ: The governor as well?

DILLS: Yeah. But he was wanting to go along with it-- Earl Warren. He could see the fairness of it. So Earl Warren and I got along fine. I told you about. . . . When you mentioned about the teamster, Leonard, a while ago. It built up the question of the health insurance and so on. Warren had to help him.

VASQUEZ: Right. We talked about that, yeah.

DILLS: Okay.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you another question that has to do

with education. It's an interesting bill that you authored in the 1968 session. It had to do with the taxation of motion pictures for the benefit of education. Do you remember that?

DILLS: It wasn't for the benefit of education. No, it wasn't for the benefit of education.

VASQUEZ: Maybe I've gotten my facts. . . . It was added to Section 17709 of the Education Code¹.

DILLS: It was for the benefit of the motion picture industry.

VASQUEZ: Explain that to me.

DILLS: Well, we had a very ambitious tax assessor here. I think his name was Watson.

VASQUEZ: [Philip E.] Phil Watson?

DILLS: Yup. He was assessing motion picture film at the value of the cost of production of that film. Mutiny on the Bounty cost ten million dollars. So he says, "You've got a film there. Although it's in the lot, it's there. That's personal property, but that's worth ten million dollars. So that's what you're going to be taxed, ten million dollars." What's the

1. S.B. 393, 1968 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 927.

result? That they were moving these films out to other states where they couldn't be taxed. In addition, they were moving some of the production out to Arizona, New Mexico, and New York. They were all. . . . The processing of these films, you see. They were moving industry out of here. Well, they came to me and said, "There ought to be repeal. This ought to be repealed." Well, Reagan was now governor, you see. So he understood this very well.

So the motion picture industry came to me, and I introduced the bill that repealed the personal property tax on motion picture film and the production thereof. That resulted in the first mandated program in California. Up until that time, so far as I know, we did not have to pay a community such as Burbank--the city of Burbank--where these films were stored. They were taxing them in accordance with the assessor's taxation, you see. They were in on the deal, too. So it was. . . . I don't know how many millions of dollars they get out of it. They get ten million dollars out of this one picture.

So the city of Burbank opposed the bill on the basis that they were losing this tax revenue. Perhaps the county did, too. But the city of Burbank was more particularly a protest. So we put into it the first mandated program which says that if the legislature mandates a program in which you add something new for the city or county or local government to do, [like] school districts, or if you were taking away some of their revenue, then it was mandated that we in the legislature would pay for that if they had a claim and filed a claim and the claim was deserving.

So that was the first mandated program that I know of. A little later on, I was the chief author of the first Senate Bill 90,¹ which Senate Bill 90 also provided for this same mandate. It also increased taxes, sales tax, and probably brought in a new billion dollars for education. A billion dollars for education. Later, on the third Senate Bill 90, I didn't author it, but in that one, all local

1. S.B. 90, 1972 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1406.

governments were brought into the act, and it's these new programs that carry a mandated cost that the state must assume. They completed that which I first started there in Burbank.

VASQUEZ: Explain something to me. Why is this involved in the Education Code, this taxation of the films, repealing that? Was part of the revenue going to education? Is that the argument?

DILLS: Yes, school districts. Yeah, that's true. I'd forgotten about that. Thank you.

VASQUEZ: That's what confused me for a second there.

DILLS: I think that may have been the result of the subsequent Senate Bill 90. But it doesn't matter. The same issue is involved.

VASQUEZ: Now, in 1969, you authored and passed a bill having to do with public defenders.¹ You had just come out of a period of being a judge. What was that about? What was your intent? What was your concern? Did you find that public defenders were not accessible to the indigent?

DILLS: There were not enough of them. Whenever people of my district, which is a poor-class district

1. S.B. 193, 1969 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 957.

. . . . They say the median income now is what in that article? Let me show you. Twenty-thousand dollars? Something like that.

VASQUEZ: Yes.

DILLS: It's a working-class, bedroom district. And the people don't have the money to hire any fancy lawyers or any lawyers at all. So if you do not have anyone who can stand up there and at least give you a shot at copping a plea, a lesser count or something, [and] give you a chance to have the trial put over. . . .

[End Tape 7, Side A]

[Begin Tape 7, Side B]

DILLS: . . . or don't know what they should say or should not say. They don't know their rights except [when] we as judges used to instruct them what their rights were. It is kind of like pledging allegiance to the flag and somebody who is looking outside and paying no attention. Anyway, it was before the cops had to say . . .

VASQUEZ: The Miranda . . .

DILLS: The Miranda decision.¹ Anyway, I thought it was

1. Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

desirable and necessary. I had run into it in my court days. I thought it was fair.

VASQUEZ: Do you feel that. . . . How do you feel about the shift that took place in the country in the last decade, from concern for the rights of the defendant to what some consider overconcern for the rights of the victim?

DILLS: I think it's a very much exaggerated claim that there is no concern for the victim and all the concern is for the defendant. He [the defendant] had all the rights, and he could use the Fifth [Amendment], and he could have a public defender, and the victim is dead and they can't get anything out of him. We have crowded the courts by increasing the number of things that are crimes and increasing the punishment for the crimes to the point now that we are over 30 percent underbedded. Let's put it that way, [we are] over 30 percent of our capacity in our jails. We are still putting them in and now they're. . . .

Up until they got a little bit wise to it, the guys were pleading guilty because they knew that the guilty people didn't have to come back

at another time. And they knew that the guilty people, because of a crowded jail, were not even going to go to jail. The guy who pleads not guilty, if he does not have bail, he's in jail. But the wise guys, the con men, the smart, the court-smart people that have been there before, they plead guilty and they just go on their merry way. They want jail time. They want jail time, because they're not going to have to serve it because there is no place for them. That's what we've done. And then there are county jails that have held. . . . A judge held the board of supervisors of Santa Clara County in contempt of court for their releasing people, or not releasing them, or not providing more space for them, you see. So they release them, let them out because there is no place to put them. They hadn't provided places so the courts said, "Provide places or go to the pokey yourself. We'll make room for you."

The same thing prevails in the death sentence. It should be a deterrent, stricter sentences and all, punishment of a greater number of days or money, whatever, or the death

sentence. [It] ought to be a deterrent. Well, there is no proof that it ever has been. I don't think it is. Because the person who murders, most of them [murder] people that they already know, and they do it at the spur of the moment. Even if they did plan it and all, if you don't have a good lawyer. . . . Can you tell me how many rich men have really had the electric chair and all? Just how many? There aren't very many.

VASQUEZ: What was your posture when Governor Reagan, when during Governor Reagan's tenure in office, the death penalty was reinstated?

DILLS: I told you a while ago with reference to Sieroty and Berman that I probably was more to the right and more for stricter law enforcement and stronger. . . . And so on. That was the way it was going. You were playing political suicide if you didn't go along with it, because they were so right that they knew everything about it. It would be a deterrent to put them in jail, throw them away. Deukmejian, of course, he won the governorship because he had that slogan, "Use a gun and go to jail." So now he

wants to let the prisoners work and be paid for it, so we have a new slogan. We take his slogan and put it into the proper context of time now. We say, "Use a gun and get a job." He got elected on that, and stiffer penalties and that sort of thing, and the death penalty. We've been coddling prisoners. They're going to use it on Van de Kamp, as you know. If you don't know, they will. The "Night Stalker," that was in the paper again yesterday.

VASQUEZ: Richard Ramirez?

DILLS: Yes, yes. That will be. . . . That already has become an issue. It was an issue brought up by [Mayor Dianne] Feinstein, and then it has been mentioned by [United States Senator Peter B.] Wilson. It will be mentioned again depending upon what judge fills the place of the one who resigned. [Marcus M.] Kauffman, I think it was, who resigned recently. One of the six people who were being mentioned was the district attorney man or was the prosecutor. . . . He was on the opposite side from Van de Kamp in that. This judge [Michael A. Tynan], he was the judge at that time on the Stalker case. They didn't

agree with what Van de Kamp recommended with reference to it.

These are political issues more than they are good crime-and-punishment issues. It is a. . . . You can whip up a good emotion out of a killer. Who likes them? Nobody. Child molester? I wanted to get off the bench and beat the guys up myself every time I got one of them in my court and that sort of thing. Is it any deterrent? I don't know how much. We have that problem today, and it's getting worse. We just voted again some more on drug pushers and so on. The first real tight punishment for drug pushers was introduced by my brother Clayton when I was on the bench.

VASQUEZ: What year was that?

DILLS: I don't know what year it was. But the Elks Lodge in which he and I are members circulated a petition among their members and the public. They got one million signatures on a bill to increase the penalties for those that were selling and dealing in drugs. My brother put the bill in, and it was passed in the assembly. Maybe I don't want to talk too much

about this because it gets too close to somebody who is in high spots these days. Anyway . . .

VASQUEZ: I think you should.

DILLS: They persuaded my brother, after he got over to the senate, to let another person take it over. He could be co-author. This other person would handle it, and they needed him because Governor Brown, Sr., asked Clayton to do this. They wanted to give him a good support because he was asking for a judgeship. They wanted to build it up that way. He had been a district attorney. So Clayton said, "I don't care who does it. It's all right with me." Clayton was agreeable. He wanted to get it done because a million people thought it ought to be done. George Putnam every night on TV, radio rather in those days, "The Dills bill should be passed." The Dills bill. The Dills bill. Every night he had something on the Dills bill, which came in handy for me several years later because people said, "Oh, yeah, Dills, I like you. I like that bill that you put through." I didn't have the time to tell them it was not all my credit or doing. The bill came back from the senate. It

came over from the senate. A senate bill came over. The assemblymen were so incensed at what had happened that they killed that bill and sent word over that the Dills bill was the only one that the assembly would concur in if amended, if they put in any amendments. So that is how it happened.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that process. I've heard about it more than once, where the author of a very often significant piece of legislation is asked by his own party leadership that it be put into someone else's name as chief author or whatever the case. Do you find that happens more in the senate or in the assembly? Or is it more or less the same?

DILLS: More in the assembly, I think, for the reason that they introduce more bills. That there are more of them. Also, there is more opportunity for the speaker to suggest it or get it over there if he wants to make a play. If he is taking care of the person whom he is asking to give it up, giving him what he wants, then he would have to play ball with the speaker. There is still a lot on the senate side under the

presidents pro tem that. . . . Particularly if there are presidents pro tem or persons there who are running for or want to run for a statewide office, attorney general or whatever. Those things are done over there less frequently than in the assembly, but they're done.

I had a bill in this last regular session, a bill that had to do with solid waste management, because I was one of the three co-authors on a bill to establish the first solid waste management board. It was the first tombstone bill that I ever had my name on. It was called the [John A.] Nejedly-[Edwin L.] Z'berg-Dills Solid Waste Management Act.¹

The Republicans wanted to use my bill in the last session to give Senator [Miriam R.] Bergeson some mileage, and a lot of the deals were put together by the Republicans and Roberti, Democrat. A lot of the transportation issues, the school things, the Gann limit, SCA 1, all

1. S.B. 2304, 1989-1990 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1334 (1989).

these things were put together in packages up there at that last session. Bergeson was running for lieutenant governor of California, as was John Seymour, two senators, Republicans. They wanted to do something for her. She had had some bill, but it had been used for another purpose. At the very. . . . I mean, the last minute after 2:00 of adjournment day, they came to me and said, "You have a bill on the other side. We'd like to delete your bill and put all of her bill into. . . . You can be co-author if you want to." I said, "No, thank you. It is her bill. I don't know what's going to go in it. But I've time. So if you want the bill, go."

VASQUEZ: And you withdrew your bill?

DILLS: She took my bill. The only thing that was left was the number. She became the author and added whomever she wished. I don't think my name went on it. It was a new bill, and it came bouncing out of committee. My bill was in assembly committee. They withdrew it for committee and amended it there, did all of these things in less than a half hour. It then came back to our side for concurrence. Yes, it happens. It

happened to me.

VASQUEZ: Does it matter? Does it make better law? Does it make bad law?

DILLS: Oh, I think it. . . . I don't think it makes any better law. It makes better political law.

VASQUEZ: I can see where it could make some bad law if things are being rushed through.

DILLS: Well, if you want to talk about what happened in this last session, the extraordinary session just finished November 4.

VASQUEZ: Let's do it. That is history already.

DILLS: Yes, it is history, but it ain't over yet until it's over.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about it.

DILLS: Well, I don't know if you've got enough tape for this one. You know, it's said that there are two things you should never watch happening: making sausage and legislating a law--passing a bill. This was a real sausage legislature we had this last year. Four days!

VASQUEZ: Tell me about it.

DILLS: Well, have we finished what we were on? What led into that?

VASQUEZ: We were talking about how bills get changed from

one author to the other.

DILLS: We were called into an extraordinary session, oh, November 2 or 1. We were there for four days, so I guess it was November 1 until 4. It was as a result of the earthquake in northern California, sometimes called the San Francisco Quake. But I think Watsonville and Oakland . . .

VASQUEZ: And Santa Cruz.

DILLS: . . . and the Santa Cruz area and so on are equally entitled to whatever good or bad can come out of naming it there. We were persuaded that the state ought to do something to help out, to match the 75 percent moneys that we were able to get out of the federal government. We should match that with 25 percent of our money. Whence comes the money. We decided upon one-quarter of a cent sales tax, which became effective December 1. It's the law now. It lasts for about thirteen months. It is destined to bring in \$880 million dollars. One of the bills that I'm particularly upset about was Senate Bill 38 (1X).¹ It was

1. S.B. 38 (1X), 1989-1990 First Ex. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 23 (1989).

authored by Senator [Nicholas C.] Petris.

VASQUEZ: Petris?

DILLS: P-E-T-R-I-S, of the Oakland area. He was a person who normally would not be for that which was contained in the bill. Let us back up a minute and recall that there was a Whittier Narrows earthquake in '87 which led to our passing a measure adding to the definition of a local government. We added at that time, "school district." A local agency is defined in the government code as a city, a city and county. We added "school district" to that definition in 1988 to take care of the '87 earthquake situation. That would enable schools to participate in funds for damages done to their facilities in that earthquake. Without that, of course, they would not be able to get any funds. However, they didn't mention community colleges. And they didn't mention county offices of education, which have school functions, too. So those two were added in this Senate Bill 38X. Then the thing that I objected to was an amendment in that section. They also added the term "private nonprofit corporation."

There must be in California eight, ten, twelve thousand of them. [Actually, now 45,000!]*

VASQUEZ: Nonprofit?

DILLS: Nonprofit. They don't have to pay taxes, you see. You have your Red Cross and your United Way and your universities and your private colleges, private schools, Rotary Clubs. . . . Just nonprofit organizations, where they have become a corporation or an organization. Thereby, they do not have to pay taxes under Revenue Code Section 1.501(a)-1.¹ Okay. Now, for the first time in California, a government agency, a local agency, is described as a private, nonprofit corporation. So that gives them some kind of a governmental quality, but what kind? Who among them, if not all of them, is eligible for funds if they've had some damages as a result of the quake? I objected to that being in there at all, because it first of all increased the number of groups out there

* Dills added the following bracketed section during his review of the transcript.

1. A nonprofit tax designation.

that are going to be filing claims.

The amount of money that we said would be allocated to the nonprofit organizations was \$40 million. Of that, Stanford University said their damages were \$11 million. So we in the Policy Committee put in a limitation of \$1 million on any one of them. Then, in our Appropriations Committee, they upped that and I voted against it. They upped it to \$5 million dollars. So \$5 million is the limit that anyone could get. Now Stanford University, under present law, is not entitled to a dime because they were not a local agency, and you cannot give it to them at all. But if you can take a nonprofit organization, a nongovernmental organization, and make it a governmental agency by definition, do you in fact make it a governmental organization? If you do, what kind of powers or rights or immunities does that organization have?

I proposed an amendment on the floor. The amendment did this: It provided that "local agency" does not include private sectarian or denominational organizations or institutions.

So that Loyola Marymount, or Saint Johns Academy, or a Seventh-Day Adventist private school academy, or none of the sectarian or denominational institutions, could get any funds from this. Because the constitution, in two different places, our state constitution prohibits it. I pointed that out. So we've asked the public to put in, through the one-quarter cent sales tax, \$800 million now. There will be more later, because that bill is still there, and it is still active. This definition will be there when this disaster is over.

VASQUEZ: Right.

DILLS: So we have a new group of people. I pointed out to them that we are hereby defining a private corporation as a governmental agency and permitting funds to go to parochial, denominational schools, sectarian schools, and so on; that we are in violation of two sections of the constitution.

VASQUEZ: Which are?

DILLS: Which are Article XVI and Section V, titled "Religious Institutions, Grants Prohibited." It reads as follows . . .

VASQUEZ: Go on, read it.

DILLS: "Neither the legislature, nor any county, city and county, townships, school district, or other municipal corporations shall ever make an appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, or grant anything to or in aid of any religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose, or help to support or sustain any school, college, university, hospital, or other institution controlled by any religious creed, church or sectarian domination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of personal property or real estate ever be made by the state or any city, city and county, town, or other municipal corporation for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever." And then it goes on to say something about an exception, which is a school for the blind. They make an exception there for the school for the blind. Then we have one other section. That is Article IX. No. I gave you the wrong one a while ago, didn't I? Excuse me. The first one was Section V of Article XIV. Is that what I gave you?

VASQUEZ: Yeah, that's correct. That's what you gave me.

DILLS: Well, then this one is Section VIII of Article IX, okay. The title is "Sectarian Schools, Public Money Doctrines." Section VIII: "No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools. Nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught or instruction thereon be permitted directly or indirectly in any of the common schools of this state." Now, that's what the constitution says in two places. It is clear language. And it mentions whether appropriations or grants or giving of aid or supporting or sustaining, uses all of those words so that you can't twist around and say, "Well, this is not an appropriation." So [this was] my contention then when I presented the amendment to exclude the private sectarian and denominational agencies or institutions in accordance with the constitution. I got only ten votes for my amendment.

VASQUEZ: Why?

DILLS: They argued, and Nick Petris is a good lawyer.

Nick Petris is doing a job here that I am sure he would not like to do, because he not only believes the same as I do in his field. . . . He said it was awfully hard for him to be in opposition to me. That was personal. But this was on an issue in which we've always agreed, that separation of church and state is for the benefit of the church. It's for the benefit of religion. It's not for the benefit of the state. That is why we have to keep it inviolate. If we don't, why, we'll get a little Khomeini or we'll get a big Stalin on one end or the other. We don't need any Khomeinis. We don't need any Stalins. We don't need any religious leader. We don't need any government telling us what religion we must follow, as in Iran or other places. We don't need any government that tells us that we can't have any religion, as in Stalin's case.

[Mikhail S.] Gorbachev yesterday, at his discussion with the pope, says, "We'll have religious freedom." So now there is another evil empire thing that is going out of the window. You can't stir up so many people

against it. Okay, these are personal things that I can't refrain from saying because they are so pertinent today. You go messing around with our basic religious and personal and private liberties. . . . "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." That's what it says, the first amendment to the Constitution. [James] Madison, in his letters, says that's what it means. It means separation of church and state. It means that, for the reason that you've got to protect your religious liberty from your government. Why did we come over here, so many of us come over here? Because we could not practice our religions.

The pilgrims, the Huguenots in France, and the Zwinglis from Switzerland, and the other religions. . . . and the Protestants that are for reformation, followers of Martin Luther, the first Martin Luther, these are people that wanted some freedom of religion. They wanted to read the Bible. The Seventh-Day Adventists were run out of Italy because they insisted on reading the Bible, and because they insisted, as

the Jews do, that the Sabbath starts Friday night to Saturday night. That is the seventh day.

Sunday is the first day. But history shows that a Roman emperor. . . . When the invaders came in, they were sun worshipers. So he agreed. . . . His name will come to me maybe a little later. Anyway, he agreed with them that if they would become Christians, why, he would change the Holy Day over to "sun" day. A little history of religion wouldn't do a bit of harm to a lot of people. I've had several chances and have studied comparative religion and so on. All right, back to this.

VASQUEZ: Back to the legislative process of this?

DILLS: The legislative process here revolved into our taking the definition of a private, nonprofit organization that is in the Federal Emergency Management Agency rules. It is called FEMA.

VASQUEZ: Right.

DILLS: We have put in the rules and regulations of FEMA in substitution for our California constitution proscriptions against the legislature and local agencies providing any appropriations, paying

any public funds, granting anything in aid, supporting or sustaining, granting or donating any personal or real property to any religious sect, church, creed, sectarian purpose, whatever. We have violated our constitution in this law. It was signed by the governor, who supported and sponsored it along with the national government, which has put it into the FEMA rules. So they said, "You betcha. We're going to give money to all of these people down there regardless of . . ."

VASQUEZ: Whose interests do they have in mind?

DILLS: I would think that they have in mind those religious groups that have institutions-- colleges, schools--that are not public and over which there is no public control. They have in mind certain others, such as Red Cross. They have in mind, of course, Salvation Army. Although Salvation Army would not, Red Cross would be eligible under my amendments. My amendment didn't cut out the nonsectarian or nondenominational colleges, schools, universities, organizations or hospitals. But it did and would because the constitution cuts

them out. The people adopted this. The legislature adopted this. So the law . . .

VASQUEZ: So what you're saying is that this aid . . .

DILLS: I told them, "This has got to go to court."

VASQUEZ: This aid bill is unconstitutional? Well, it will be challenged.

DILLS: That is what I say. I say it would be in court. I don't know if it would be in court in time to stop their granting some of these moneys away.

VASQUEZ: Will you participate in challenging that?

DILLS: Well, I would if I could. I would furnish every bit of evidence that I could at such a time as it's heard in the court. I know what was brought up because I brought them up.

VASQUEZ: Do you know or see anyone on the horizon who will probably contest this?

DILLS: There may be several groups before we're through. There could well be a group called United for Separation of Church and State. It's a nationwide organization of which I am a member. The Seventh-Day Adventist church are as opposed to the government coming in and. . . . For the reasons that I want to make clear in the

record. It is for the benefit of religious freedom not to have government, either a theocracy or a dictatorship, tell them what they should do. The Adventists wanted to read the Bible, the Catholic church would not permit them to. "We will interpret the Bible our own way. This is what it is. This is the church. You will not have the privilege."

I must tell you that there was an editorial in each of the L.A. Times and the Sacramento Bee, in which. . . . In the Bee, it was designated as retrogressive bishops. In the Los Angeles Times, it was called something about an ambitious bishop or something. It had to do with Assemblywoman Lucy Killea, a prelate there telling a member of the legislature who had voted pro-choice that she could not have communion. I thanked them for their timely editorial and pointed out that I thought it was a distressing thing, but a very significant thing in view of the fact and the consequences of the denial of a religious liberty through imposition of clerical control upon the state or its public officials. Then I went on and wrote

all of these things here, delineating. . . . I am going to give you a copy of this.

VASQUEZ: Okay.

DILLS: So if I haven't read it correctly, if you didn't understand what I am reading, I'll just give you a copy of this.

VASQUEZ: Okay.

DILLS: Okay. We adopted then by statute what I think were unconstitutional provisions of a statute to the detriment of both sides, the state of California and to those agencies that would start to lean on it, because I asked certain questions. I call this process "legal legerdemain" of the Deukmejian administration. So I asked, "How could a private nonprofit school--either sectarian, denominational, or nonsectarian or nondenominational--receive any public funding in view of the California Constitution limitations?"

The third definition, a famous definition of a public entity, is "an organization formed for a public purpose whose direction and funding are provided by one or more political subdivisions of the state." That's a public

entity, they call it. We call it a local agency here, okay, which means a nongovernmental agency or entity. How does a private school, college, or university become a political subdivision of a state? By defining it as a local agency. That's what they're trying to do. If the private institution is not formed for a public purpose, whose direction and funding are not provided by one or more political subdivisions of the state under FEMA, then by what legal process can the legislature turn this defined nongovernmental agency into a governmental local agency? These are lawyers' arguments, but they all make sense.

FEMA defines educational facility. It says in part, "Private nonprofit means [an] educational-type facility providing essential governmental-type services to the general public." So they're going to say, "Well, there it is just because we say so." And educational facility means classrooms plus [the] related supplies, equipment, machinery, and utilities of an educational institution necessary or appropriate for instructional, administrative,

and support purposes. Well, it does not include buildings, structures, and related items used primarily for religious purposes or instruction. That's the usual federal rule. But educational facilities, which we now. . . . So I asked this question, "Applying these rules to the California earthquake disaster, a private sectarian school X, for example would be eligible for classroom reconstruction and books Which science books? Evolution or creation? Which of them? A religious icon? Suppose some of the things that they have in their church are destroyed?"

VASQUEZ: Should the state pay for that?

DILLS: Yeah. Computers, paper, pencils, blackboards, musical instruments, equipment, machinery, shops, gas, electricity, water, other utilities, plus instructional and support items. That's what their definition is. Can we furnish Bibles and Korans and Torahs to the appropriate religious institutions out of only \$40 million set aside for all nonprofit institutions? With Stanford taking \$5 million of the \$40 million, and USC and some of the others. . . . USC

wouldn't get on the list, but University of Santa Clara could and would. In order to receive funds for disaster relief, what will be the effect on the rights, privileges, powers, and immunities of private, nonprofit institutions? Must classrooms be renovated or rebuilt to comply with the Field Act provisions as public schools must do?

After the big quake in 1933, [Assemblyman] Don [C.] Field, an assemblyman. . . . He served with me later--I served with him later--he put in the Field Act¹ that these buildings must be built in accordance with earthquake-proof types of materials, structures and so on. Now, will these people, by taking this money, are they going to rebuild? Will somebody from the state have to come out to their parochial school or university and say, "Does this conform to the Field Act? You are taking money." Public schools do [have to conform].

VASQUEZ: What I hear you saying is there is a very dangerous rift that is taking place here in that

1. Field Act, Cal. Educ. Code § 15451 et seq. (1959).

. . .

DILLS: To them! To them, what's happening here is. . . .
I'll put it in another way a little further on.
I'll get to it. I will finish that quick interpolating here. Do the private schools have to comply with collective bargaining provisions for their employees under the Rodda, Berman, or Dills acts? Do the teachers and instructors have to meet the same public provisions for educational preparation and qualifications? What will be the effect on private institutions regarding segregation?

[End Tape 7, Side B]

[Begin Tape 8, Side A]

DILLS: What will be the effect on private institutions regarding segregation, affirmative action, or the existing asbestos-removal requirements? Or prayers? Or the flag salute, which they can do in their parochial schools--they could do both of them and are doing them. Or other legal controls which are mandatory provisions applicable to the public schools? For instance, will the Gann spending limit apply? It applies to our public schools. You can't spend any more than

the population increase and cost of living. That's what Gann is. Will the private institutions be liable for damages as public ones are, their administrators and so on? You can sue them if you don't like the way they treat the kids. Will private schools be bound by the limitations of class size, or the number of hours within the day, and the number of days within the year? Or what school holidays? Will they be bound by the same as the others?

Are the directors, trustees, partners, administrators, and so forth of a private, nonprofit institution under the "open meeting rules" of public schools? You've got to have open public meetings except in certain personnel matters. And your schools, your school boards--they've got to have an agenda, you've got to have a public meeting--are they going to do the same thing? Are they asking for it? Are those people going to be--although they may not be running for office--are they going to be under FPPC rules and regulations? People that are in government--even those that are not elected, who are appointed, who are in civil service, or

whatever--those people, if they're getting any donations or whatever, some acute situations will arrive. And will, for instance, the students in our denominational schools be eligible for the driver education funds under the new bill that I got the governor to sign this year [1989]? That [bill] increased from \$85 to \$97 the amount of average daily attendance money we are going to send down this coming year for driver education purposes. Are they eligible? Will this make them eligible for driver education funds? These questions need to be answered. They present an urgent need for a reexamination and repeal of that provision of Senate Bill 38, which adds a nonprofit organization to the definition of local agency in Section 8680.25 of the Government Code of California. I will give you a copy of all of this.

There's sausage being made at Sacramento, legal sausage, statutory sausage, and the elimination of the constitutional provisions. Where [do] we go from here in connection with that? Okay. Every opportunity I have I'm going

to make my views public on the subject. I'm going to introduce a bill--because our special session is still in session--and I probably will put a bill into the January 3 session, which will be the regular session, for a repeal of the addition of a nonprofit corporation to the definition of local agency. That's how it got in there--by the legislature--and we can take it out. They did not adequately go into this thing. They did not research it. They just pushed it through in a big fast and fat hurry in the last day of the session there. There were amendments put in that we hadn't even seen. They brought them up on the floor and they usually. . . . Well, they may have had some review of them by a select committee that we have there, but in that last. . . . They were bringing them in at the very time we were debating the bills. So it was a very, very haphazard thing.

VASQUEZ: You've been reciting to me the legal implications and the legal arguments and the legal basis for this action. Recite for me now the political forces and the political interests

and the political fortunes that are behind this process.

DILLS: Well, the immediate thing emanates from the federal government's adoption last year of these--it was this year, I think--of these FEMA rules. They had a bad time trying to work out the hurricane--Hurricane Hugo, wasn't it?--the Hurricane Hugo thing. And so they made some changes. And I think those changes in FEMA were done on March 21, 1989.

VASQUEZ: I guess what I was trying to get at. . . . The state, at the state level, what . . . ?

DILLS: Yes, yes, I hear you, but . . .

VASQUEZ: Because somebody's ox is getting gored here.

DILLS: Yes. Let me tell you who it is: the public. [Laughter] FEMA is going to put their federal money-- And 75 percent of all of this is going to be federal money. We're putting up 25 percent. All of the 75 percent goes in under the FEMA regulations, which were adopted March 21, 1989. So it has come. . . . The emphasis has come from the federal government, which is Bush, which is Reagan, which is [William] Bennett (formerly secretary of education), which

is the voucher system, which is a turnover to the religious right all of the things that they want, to wit: prayer in the schools, flag salute, all of those things that they made issues of in the last campaign. And they've found a very clever way of doing it: by rules and regulations, which they so deplored whenever they were out of office but have put in and used to a great advantage these days.

And it's the same old argument that when they say our public schools have failed us, we ought to have competition with the private school. Competition. Not cooperation but competition. You see, they want competition with everybody except those that are competing against the United States. They don't want any competition with Japan. They don't want Japan to outdo us, you see, and other things. They claim, "Look what they're doing in Japan in education," without reference to the fact that there's just one culture there. There's usually just one religion, there's Buddhism and there's Shintoism, and so on, but mostly Buddhism. And most particularly, there is a family unit there

with a family work ethic and a family discipline. If you do not go to school and learn, why, you are an outcast in your own family, the people that care for you most. And so they don't. They commit hari-kari if they can't cut it. And there's one language spoken. A little school up there. . . .

Have you met Polly, my administrative assistant?

VASQUEZ: Yes. Polly Gardner, yes.

DILLS: Polly Gardner. Her daughter, who is the treasurer of my campaign funds, she's a teacher in Elk Grove. And they have seventeen different languages spoken in that school. We can't afford money for bilingual teachers, we can't afford money for so many things that these young people need and all of our public schools need. We have high school books today--believe me, Carlos--high school books today saying, "Some day we may go to the moon." They're talking about . . .

VASQUEZ: They're talking about forty-eight states.

DILLS: Forty-eight states, I think I may have mentioned that to you, or you knew it from other people.

We don't have textbooks adequately. We don't have these things. We have \$5 billion, \$5 billion of approved plans by the state allocation board of funds. These have already been approved. In Lynwood and everywhere else where they need to renovate or to build new structures to keep up with the population, where they have sixty people in some classrooms, they never talk about it. Double sessions. . . . There's not a dime of money for these already approved. . . . Five billion dollars. We have an \$800 million bond issue next November. Who's going to benefit? Well, surely the public schools are not going to benefit by taking. . . . Although it's a pittance now. What's a pittance now becomes a little bit larger, particularly if you just forget about this as relief for disaster. This is just "general relief," if you could prove your case.

VASQUEZ: So you feel this opens the door to . . . ?

DILLS: It absolutely opens the door. And they will next want the voucher system, where the dollar follows the student. If he is in Compton and the parents want him to go to Santa Monica. . . .

And there are bills around. . . . Five different bills in the session this year for parental choice, free choice of parents to take their kids wherever they want to take the kid. The next thing, of course, is voucher. These are all steps in the direction of public financing of private school institutions. Okay. And we have adopted it. Deukmejian has taken over that same thing. Wilson will do the same thing if he's elected governor, and his chances are better today than any Democrat that I see. But tomorrow it may be different. But anyhow, that's the way I see it today.

VASQUEZ: So this is an example of legislative process where even the constitution can be a victim.

DILLS: It can be a victim unless it's challenged. And I have every reason to believe it will be challenged, maybe, by some of these "card-carrying" American Civil Liberties Union people whenever they really learn what it's all about. Some gal who asked me, "Why are you saying that it's unconstitutional? I called up somebody down there in the Los Angeles office and they said, 'No, it's not. No, it's not

unconstitutional.'" I said, "Well, I don't know to whom you talked, but I want to talk to the headman, the lawyer there, not some girl or some intern or whatever." Okay.

VASQUEZ: All right. Let's move along. In 1982, you sponsored S.B. 145, which changes the structure of the inheritance tax.¹ Or this was your intent?

DILLS: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

DILLS: Well, it was our intent to eliminate the inheritance tax. It is a tax that, I think, no longer raises enough money to justify its being on the books. I felt it ought to be repealed in California. And I feel that way about it.

VASQUEZ: You argued that working people pay taxes on the home that they buy, and then if they have to pay taxes again when they die, or their estate or their relatives have to pay taxes when they die again, many times they can't afford it and thereby lose the property, and that it's unfair.

DILLS: That's right.

1. S.B. 145, 1981-1982 Reg. Sess. (1982).

VASQUEZ: I remember this was your logic.

DILLS: That's right. It does more harm than it does good for most people.

VASQUEZ: Whom does it do good for?

DILLS: Well, it does good for the big estates. A Coca-Cola queen or whatever. It does a lot of good for them. They never have to pay. . . . Their heirs would not have to pay inheritance tax on those things that they have set up in foundations; they've got it beat. It doesn't apply to the big guys anymore, because they've got all these foundations that they can put their money in, and it keeps their name going and gets pay for the family out of running the foundation. So they've got it made.

VASQUEZ: It's the little guy, again, that doesn't . . . ?

DILLS: It doesn't apply to the big guy anymore, it's just the little guy. So let's get rid of it. We put it in and we passed it, and I think it got changed into, oh, the Here again, I've given so many of my bills and my committee membership and my functions to help out somebody else. And when [Senator] Wadie [P.] Deddeh was chairman of the Assembly Revenue and Taxation

Committee, he had put in a bill, too. I got mine over there before he had his out of committee. So he asked me, he says, "Ralph, can we take my bill? And you can go on as co-author on it." I said, "Go, let's get the job done." It was like my brother in that drug thing. So we didn't raise any question about it. And it went through. Then the next year, why, an initiative act. . . .¹ [Senator Don] Rogers started that one, and that initiative act just took over. They put it in as an initiative act so that the legislature couldn't mess with it anymore. So it became the law. The repeal was done by an initiative act, although we'd already done it. Many of the things happen like that.

VASQUEZ: Let me talk to you about another bill . . .

DILLS: Let me give you one more bill that I'm proud of. When I was in the assembly, at the request of all of the veterans' groups in California, I introduced a bill¹ that would require that

1. Proposition 6 (June 1982).

2. A.B. 306, 56th Leg., Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 274 (1945).

classes in American history and government shall be taught and passed. A class in it shall be taught and passed by the students in the elementary, the secondary, and the college level of public education.

VASQUEZ: What year would that be, more or less?

DILLS: Gosh, it was in the assembly in the forties, I don't know.

VASQUEZ: Okay, go on then.

DILLS: I don't really know what year. Now, we were going to talk, too, about what my Great Books But we'll get back to that after we've done public things.

VASQUEZ: But tell me more about this bill. What was the idea behind it?

DILLS: The idea behind it was that our students, at all these levels, should at least know what their government is, what an executive is, what the president's or the governor's job is, what the legislature's job is, who has what power, our U.S. Constitution, the division of powers, the separation of powers, the judicial powers and what powers the judges have over the legislature or the executive; all of these things that are

such politically hot issues now and were then. What Roosevelt was doing in the New Deal. And they had to declare his AAA [Agricultural Adjustment Administration] and all of these alphabetical things that he had put out in the first 100 days. They got the AAA and these other bills kicked out by the Supreme Court ruling, and so he started to stack the Court and increase the number so that he could have more appointees and control it.

And he might have succeeded but for a fellow by the name of Alben W. Barkley, who was a senator from Tennessee, I think it was. Barkley later became vice president, as you know, under Harry Truman. I got well acquainted with him out here handling the campaign in 1948. Barkley sent Roosevelt a letter that said, "If you do that, you've lost me, you've lost your Senate, you're not going to get any of your people approved by the Senate. You will not stack our Supreme Court!" And there was a letter that came back, "Dear Alben, okay, okay, okay." [Laughter] But it led to that, it was quite a famous incident in history at that time.

If the students are not exposed to our government, they think of it as someplace out there. They don't think about it as streets and roads and highways and schools and street signs and things that they live with, radios and TVs and the licensing of them, and the availability of parking. They have to understand that government is an instrumentality of the people to do those things which the people want done for themselves but that they cannot do alone. It's not an evil empire. It is not what our friend Reagan [said], "Get the government off our backs." You know, put it on the labor man. Take it off our back but put government on top of him. Also, the idea of throwing money at schools. They say that won't improve or increase our schools, you see. They want to run down the schools to show all of the warts and so on of the schools without remembering that we're trying to do something that no nation in history has ever done or ever will do, and that's to educate every kid. Every kid. Or every oldster for that matter, so long as they want to go to school and we can pay for it. We are paying for

it and it's free. It should be free, taxpayer free. It's our government doing things for our people. That's what government is, an agency to do it for your people.

VASQUEZ: I think this would be a good place to bring in the discussion that we were having off tape about your concern for including in our educational system the Great Books.

DILLS: Well, I had not thought of the Great Books, although I did set up one class, by gosh, I did, in Compton High School, one Great Books class.¹ I'd forgotten that I'd done it as a class, but more particularly I had in mind. . . . I just did it for one year. I had in mind the fact that for seven years I led a Great Books discussion group, and those groups came out of the University of Chicago, Professor [Mortimer] Adler, you remember. And my co-leader was George A. Wilde. You have him [discussed] previously. He was a law associate of mine, and when I became judge I was able to persuade him to come over and be my first jury and traffic

1. Study of the classics of Western Classics.

commissioner. Now he's retired. I saw him last Saturday night at a function where the Masons were.

We led this group of, oh, sometimes we'd have fifteen, sometimes it was twenty. But we'd read a book, and every two weeks we would come in and discuss it. The discussion leaders do not participate in the discussion. All we do is ask questions, get them started: "How about that?" "Oh, is that so?" "That's the way you see it?" You know. "And do you think the same way?" Just lead them on, let somebody. . . . "What's the Book of Job?" That was one of the books. "What's the Book of Job all about anyway?" Incidentally, so far as I'm concerned, the one thing that Job showed [is in] the one expression where he says, "That which I most feared has come upon me." What a true statement of the difference between negative thinking and affirmative thinking--positive thinking. "That which I most feared has come upon me." That's the nut, that's really the nut there of the Book of Job, as I see it. Now, other people read it differently, you know. But we read all of these

books for seven years, and it was a joy. I think you remember that Steve Allen and his wife did "Meeting of the Minds."

VASQUEZ: That's right. Jayne Meadows.

DILLS: Jayne Meadows. Based upon the Great Books program which came out of the University of Chicago.

VASQUEZ: And what's your thinking behind that? What's the purpose? What would that do toward bringing about a well-educated person?

DILLS: That created, first of all, a desire to read and to know what really constitutes a great book. Why, the Communist Manifesto was in there. Whoa! When I taught the first year, it was in the first year, whoa baby! One of the newspapers took me on for a communist. [Laughter] Well, if you don't know what communism is or what it's supposed to be, if you don't know what Marx and Engels have said, how in the world do you know what you're fighting? So it was the idea to educate people, to make them do some thinking, to give them the joy of having to wonder, "What makes this a great book? What's so great about this?" You know,

what's so great about a guy by the name. . . .
Some carpenter down . . ? But he has had more
effect upon all of civilization than any other
greats of anyplace.

VASQUEZ: The carpenter [Jesus] from Nazareth?

DILLS: Yes, that fellow. [Laughter] So what's so
great about one of those books about him? So it
led the present mayor--no, I guess he isn't
mayor this year--and a city councilman. . . .
There are two of them: [Charles] Chuck Weldon
was the former mayor, and he is an attorney, and
the other city councilman there [George
Mulrooney] was a member of that group. We often
commiserated about it. Last year they had me
over to Paramount to see the good things that I
had done there, which I think I adverted to . . .

VASQUEZ: Yes, you did in the last session.

DILLS: So they remembered very fondly those meetings we
had. That's a part of my life. I'm a book
lover. I love to learn. I read everything that
I can get my hands on and have time for. And I
would like to see more libraries. I'd like to
see us expand them instead of shutting them
down.

To educate people pays dividends in money, pays dividends in a lack of crime. Why is it that 50 percent of the people in our state and federal prisons are not literate? Why are they in prison? It may well be that at least half of the 50 percent are there because they can't read and write, or maybe all of them are there because they can't, because they have no way to earn money. They can't even fill out a job application and read a paper or an ad. And what do they do? Well, they do what the drug addict does, whatever he can steal. He'll go out and rob and take from the person, if he can't steal from their places, steal money to. . . . So crime has a cause someplace down there. And we can have all the Drug Commissioner Bennetts throwing money at the drug problem--and [they are] going to do it in Washington, D.C., as a pilot program--doing exactly the same thing, which is making the same mistake all over again. You don't do anything by just doing what we're already doing. You start other places. You've got to start with the kids now. Okay.

They can throw money, let me add, at the

savings and loans. Oh, that's not throwing money; that's, you know, to protect our financial institutions. Oh, yes, yes, yes. Makes a difference whom you throw money to.

VASQUEZ: Let me perhaps move into the more pedestrian topics but no less controversial. It's been something that has given you problems more than once. And that has to do. . . . Let me focus it: In 1985, you had S.B. 589,¹ which had to do with the beer industry especially, having certain restrictions . . .

DILLS: "Beer barons."

VASQUEZ: You caught a lot of flak from people like Common Cause, and in fact the bill went through both houses but was vetoed by Governor Deukmejian.

DILLS: That it was.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about. . . . On the grounds of free trade, I believe, was his argument. Tell me about that.

DILLS: Yeah. Well, the major stores, large retail stores, "mom-and-pop Safeway," if you like that, they did not want limitations upon prices and

1. S.B. 589, 1985-1986 Reg. Sess. (1985).

districts and areas, because they have their Brown Derby and other beers that they manufacture in their own names. They can run those as "loss leaders." You know what that means?

VASQUEZ: No.

DILLS: Well, "Come on in, buy a six-pack of beer here for half as much as you can pay for a six-pack of Coors or Bud or Miller's Lite, or anything else." And so they use these loss leaders, and they'll run these things in ads out there. They do it with Coca-Cola, the soft drinks and so on. They were doing it with these other different beer brands. The little guys, the true mom-and-pops, the independents, they can't buy in the same volume as they buy, they can't do the advertising that they do. And so they can't run ads for loss leaders--maybe mayonnaise or something--but they have to pay a certain amount for it and can't sell it for less than cost. They have to cut their mustard out of that. Most of the mom-and-pops, as in the case of a restaurant, it's your drinks that bring [them] the money. These little liquor stores

and all, franchised around, 7-Elevens, most of that is liquor. The drinks are the principal money sales, and the food is just there, just as sort of an accommodation. So I believe that to be a fact, that it is in the welfare of the majority of people in my district and in the state for them to have these level fair playing grounds where you can't sell products below cost to lure purchasers to your stores. That's the way I saw it, but of course the so-called self-appointed leaders of consumers say, "Oh! They want to keep prices high." And, "It's against the consumer." And it's more like "Common Curse," as I call them on the floor, as that article mentioned, than like Common Cause.

VASQUEZ: Yes, that's in the article.

DILLS: I did. Now, the guy that is writing all those nasty things about me, I wonder why? Well, he was just a politician. He's a candidate for . . .

VASQUEZ: Walter [A.] Zelman.

DILLS: He's a candidate now for . . .

VASQUEZ: Insurance commissioner.

DILLS: For insurance commissioner. I wonder what kind of politics that is? You know, he's promising

to make everything good for the. . . . He's going to do the anti-redlining, yes, that I've tried to do in the insurance field. The anti-redlining bills. He's going to take care of all the people because that's a hot subject, and there's a job for him to take. He'll change his thoughts a little bit later too, but right now he's the great consumer advocate.

VASQUEZ: That takes me to a central question I wanted to ask you, and that is how did your initial plans, or your initial intent when you went into the senate, get changed to accommodate the reality of what you found there? Do you see what I'm asking?

DILLS: Yeah.

VASQUEZ: How were you thrown cold water on about certain ideas that you really felt strong on? Give me an idea or example.

DILLS: Well, I think you may be addressing yourself to [my] being a little more kind to business and to industry and to strong or strict law enforcement. Hmm?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

DILLS: And the environmental situation.

VASQUEZ: Well, perhaps. Those are specific areas in which you felt that maybe you had to hue a different line as a result of trying to get something accomplished once you got up to . . .

DILLS: Well, you can hold onto your beliefs because they're your own personal conviction. And then you find out that you're telling your constituents what's good for them. You run for office to represent them. Now, if I have any abilities at all other than political abilities, I think it's an ability to determine what my people like and what they don't like. I trip on my toes once in a while, and for different reasons than they would attribute to it. But in connection with the beer barrel thing--they call it the "beer baron bill," it's nicely alliterated, BBB--I feel that I owe it to my constituency to be a true representative as much as I can without it interfering with my own principles and convictions, to represent them at Sacramento. Now, I'm chairman of the Governmental Organization Committee. That has--that story will tell you--that has gambling in it, lottery . . .

VASQUEZ: "Juice committee" it's called, isn't it?

DILLS: "Juice committee." Well, that's one of the, quote, "juice committees." The assumption is that that's the committee which, if you get on it, why, you're really going to get lots of money and campaign contributions, or donations, or under-the-table or. . . . "Juice" means under-the-table, really. It doesn't mean campaign contributions. It has illegal and negative connotations, which is why they use it if they want to break you down. Well, let them go ahead and call it a "juice committee" or any other damn thing they want to. But take a look at what I get there and compare it with what the Republicans get.

VASQUEZ: That's what I noticed, that even from the beer and wine industries, your Republican counterparts usually get more than you do.

DILLS: Always, always. And being reminded of this, I've been reapportioned three times. Now, when I first went in, my district was much more conservative, much more conservative. I didn't have Compton, I didn't have Lynwood, I didn't have. . . . I had Willowbrook. No, I didn't. I

had some of Watts. But I had Gardena, and I had Lomita, and I had Carson--which is a little bit of uptown compared to Wilmington or Watts--and I had San Pedro. I had the harbors of Los Angeles and Long Beach. I had some of Long Beach--the wealthy part, or I mean the front part of Long Beach, Seventh Street south. That was a more conservative district than I'd ever had as an assemblyman. And I conformed as best I could without breaking. . . .

And mostly it was in the field which then was of crime, Reagan crime, crime. All of the Republican good things. They bought me. They elected me. They felt that a judge, perhaps, with assembly experience--none of the people running against me had had any legislative experience, a couple of city councilmen but. . . . Anyway, the district was considerably more conservative, and there was a more conservative wave in 1966, as you know, or they would not have elected Reagan. He beat Brown by about a million votes, didn't he? Running against government. So do I truly represent my district? And in those times I was a judge, I

was for strict, strict enforcement. I'd practice it. If a convicted criminal deserved it, you bet, I gave the max.

So then, in 1974, in the '74 elections, they had reapportioned me. They took away San Pedro, they took away Long Beach, they took away most of Wilmington. They gave me back Gardena, they gave me Hawthorne and Lawndale, and they gave me Bellflower. Now, but for Lomita, Hawthorne, and Lawndale, I had been a judge or assemblyman in those places since 1938. Now I'm back over--at that time--in the more liberal, pro-labor group of people. That doesn't mean to imply that San Pedro is not pro-labor. Of course they are; it's a very strong labor town. And they liked me for that too, because my labor record in the assembly, and as a judge and so on, was fitting. And I wasn't going to change that, and I still haven't. Anyway, then in 1980-something, they changed me, switched me around again.

VASQUEZ: 'Eighty-one.

DILLS: 'Eighty-one, was that the year? Lordy. And they took away Hawthorne and Lawndale and Lomita

and gave me more of Watts. And 65 percent of the new district was Long Beach west of. . . . Anyway, I'll remember in a minute--west of Atlantic [Boulevard]. That was the old part of town. That was the senior citizens, the blacks, and the browns--the poor people. Now it's Cambodian, the largest. So my district changed three times. Now, maybe I hadn't changed that many times. On some issues, I guess it would appear I have. On environment, I still believe we've got to have some jobs for people. I don't like the water I drink here. This is lousy water, but it's water. I don't like the air all that much, but I can breathe it. And my people are living here, and they're going to school here, and they're working here, and they're raising kids here, and they're supporting churches here, and so on, and they have to have jobs to do that.

VASQUEZ: I guess what flows from that then would be a question of what has made you so successful or so effective that you've been able to get reelected sixteen times? And, as the Los Angeles Times in a recent article would

predict, a seventeenth time? You're known for not spending a lot of time in your district.

DILLS: There are perhaps two or three answers. The first answer goes to that one. That charge is always used by an opponent that, "He is not here in the district." My answer is that I'm not the mayor of Gardena. I'm not a supervisor of Los Angeles County. I ran for, and they asked me to take over, a job. That job is at Sacramento. And the people in 1966 passed Proposition 1, which made the senate a full-time job.

They increased the salaries from \$6,000 to \$16,000. Well, that was no particular inducement for me, because I was [leaving] my judge's pay of \$23,500 to run for a job that paid \$6,000. My wife said, "You're crazy!" I said, "Well, you're right. But that's what I think I'd like to do. Go with me." And she did. I ran for it because, as I may have told you before, why would I leave the assembly in the first place? And I said, "Sixty-three hundred reasons." Those were dollars in those days, because as an assemblyman I only got \$100 a month--\$1,200 a year--compared to \$7,500 as a

judge, and [I] could practice law. But more particularly, there was the situation of the future as a teacher. And so I studied law, and I wanted to put that law. . . . I could be in the legislature and practice law. Okay. But I didn't like the law.

Anyway, getting into why I went back up to the legislature. As a judge, I said, I had to do too many things to people that were unpleasant. It's no fun to sentence a man to jail. And he deserves it when he's molested a child or he has beat up "the little woman" or he's just plain drunk raising all sorts of Cain. But if that's the only thing that will stop him, then I have to do it for his safety and for the safety of the family or of the people. So I send him to jail. And the next morning his wife comes in black and blue and can hardly walk. "But he's going to lose his job. What'll I do? I can't get on welfare." Okay. Those are things that are not pleasing, but it's my duty, and I do them. But after a while there's no satisfaction in doing that. I get no satisfaction. I don't feel awfully good about

doing it. And I can't play both sides there, you see. I can't do my job as a judge and protect the public and still cater to mama's demands.

So as a legislator, I can do things for people. I can establish a Long Beach State University. I can help UCLA law school [to] be established. I can help establish El Camino College. I can get for California State University, Dominguez Hills a bill passed that will permit them to increase their student fees and build themselves a student union building.¹ And with my help. . . . I've got a \$1,000 brick that I'm putting in there. I can pass laws that are helpful to senior citizens, of which I have great numbers in my district. People that are living in mobile homes. We have, I think, in the city of Carson, over twenty mobile home parks; they pretty much run their community there. These are things. . . . The people's needs have to be met by government. If they can't do it themselves,

1. S.B. 350, 1985-1986 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 580 (1985).

somebody has to do it. And I asked them to give me the job to help them do their job. And that's the way I look upon this: as representing them, and not as a job for me, because I don't need it. Now, I have the retirements. And if they really wanted me to retire as senator, they would have to pay double, because I would take my retirement money and then they would have to pay my successor. So there'd be two salaries for the public to pay. [Laughter]

[End Tape 8, Side A]

[Begin Tape 8, Side B]

DILLS: . . . not a very good argument.

VASQUEZ: But how come you've been so effective? What's the secret to your success?

DILLS: Well, if I will hazard an opinion, it's because I have lived in the Gardenas and the Comptons and the Carsons. . . . I lived in Carson after I was elected senator at a time when it wasn't even Carson, it was still county. And we. . . . I voted to incorporate it. I voted for the selection of the name. We had a choice between Dominguez and Carson. And I said, "Oh,

Dominguez's too hard to write, can't spell it anyway, so I'll take Carson." So we selected [the name] in that vote when we incorporated Carson. I was living right down there in those apartments where the Pepsi-Cola plant was, where Harbor [Freeway] and San Diego [Freeway] merge. There's what used to be a dump-- There's a golf course there [now], and there are some apartment buildings there, and there's Western Waste [Company] there, and there's a Pepsi-Cola factory there, and there's a Hertz [Rent-A-Car] thing. There are apartments there, and I lived there at that time.

I've lived here. Graduated from Gardena High School. I was president of the Gardena High School alumni association and helped to keep our pictures here, those very famous pictures that we gave to the school every year, and they were about to take them out, and so we organized and we stopped it. Now they're talking about it again, and we're about to organize again to keep them from taking those pictures out. (They were kind enough to me to name the auditorium this last May, name the

Gardena High School auditorium the Ralph C. Dills Assembly Hall.) I brought Long Beach State University there. I went to Compton College. I was president of the Compton College alumni association. I was a judge, a justice of the peace, a city judge of Lynwood, an assemblyman, a schoolteacher, a musician, a member of practically every organization that would take me. Life member of. . . . Well, you've seen the list, haven't you?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

DILLS: LULAC [League of United Latin-American Citizens], JACL [Japanese-American Citizens League], NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People], life member of the Hollywood Maskers Club, and so on. I am a part of the community. I've contributed to the community in many, many ways, not only as a legislator, but in participation and functions. I've given of myself and of my time. I like people. I think I'm a friendly person. I get along with people. I don't have any animosities. I don't have anybody that I hate or dislike--even in the legislature when

they turned down some of my good bills.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter]

DILLS: I learned a long time ago that each man or woman has the opportunity and the right to represent his or her district as she or he feels is the best way to go in order to remain there. I think I can read what my people want. I think I can capture what is politically hot, or politically sexy. We have waves of them every two years. One year it's something or other, and the next year it's something else. And you get on top of that wave and you identify with it. Right now, everybody's got a drug bill but me, I guess. And I've got to the point where now I will co-author some of them. Some of the bills are rather innocuous, but once or twice environmentalists found something that they think is not particularly good. But overall, I help whenever I can so far as the environment is concerned. What is that group that gave me an 85 percent record on the environment? The conservation and planning league. I didn't do that because I like to look good on their record; I did it because my district--and those

bills that came before me--my district just seemed to. . . . People seemed to want that sort of thing.

For years around here I was on the "bad" list of the doctors of medicine--and I may not be off of it yet, so far as I know. But I'm not kowtowing as a result of it. I'm not trying to go against what I believe. I think I may have mentioned previously that I authored the first bill that established doctors of chiropractic as eligible to serve on the workers compensation board. Well, the doctors of chiropractic in this district are for Dills because Dills was with them and their patients and understood their problems and their needs. Organized labor--of which there are thousands in my district--I am a friend of organized labor. I belong to organized labor. I have a life membership in Local 13 of the Longshoremen in San Pedro and Wilmington. I have been a member of the teachers unions. I've represented our school district teachers associations before they were unions. I was a member of the union before they got along and went into it. The

senior citizens look upon me as a kind of a [Congressman] Claude Pepper of California because of the fact that I have been with them. I helped them form their California Senior Legislature. I preside over their Senior Legislature in the senate each year when I can. I was able to repeal the responsible relatives clause when we had that previously. And so a majority in the ballot box consists of a lot of minorities. There's the minorities-- so-called special instances by that fellow by the name of [United States Senator Gary W.] Hart, who tried to pin on [United States Senator Walter] Mondale because he, Hart, didn't get labor's endorsement. He went after it and didn't get it. Then he called them "special interests" after that.

VASQUEZ: Gary Hart?

DILLS: So these are special interests. As far as I'm concerned, they are special. They're good people. And labor is a special interest. Teaching groups. Education is a special interest, sure. And what isn't? If your group is associated for the purpose of accomplishing

something for you. . . . The medical doctors have their special interests for damn sure. And the chiropractors have theirs, and the dentists theirs. The dentists have the best lobby of all in the whole world when [you] have your own dentist sitting right by you at the time you pass the bill. [Laughter] Everything is a special interest to those people who look upon it as such. They organize themselves for the reason that they wish to have clout.

I just talked this noon to a group of faculty members--the president was there, too--faculty members at Dominguez Hills university, who wanted to know what they could do to see to it that their wishes got into the question of selection of new sites for state universities. Because they said, "We think the labor, our faculties, should have something to do with it. And we think that in order to take care of the needs of the minorities--on faculties, and minority students--we ought to have more minority faculty members, and we ought to have more minorities coming to our schools." Now, Dominguez has taken care of that. If, in fact,

moneys. . . . Since we have these straitjackets of Gann and Jarvis on us, moneys are hard to get. The limit cannot be exceeded. We can't do as Reagan does and run a credit-card business into the trillion-dollar deficit. We can't do that in California. So they said, "Why, if we're going to have new universities. . . ."

One is already at San Marcos, has been selected. And they are talking about putting one in Fresno, and maybe one in Ventura, and I'm not sure where else. Three more state universities they are talking about. So they said, "We'd like to have something to say about where these are to be located. Is there going to be a cap on the number of students? We are increasing here but are we going to be able to get enough money to upgrade our own situation here?" They've got a legitimate cause. And they said, "We're with you. We know you've been with us, and we're with you. And you are coming up in the next campaign and we want to help."

Now, that's a special interest. Okay, I'll take it. That's a special interest.

And a legitimate business--in Gardena and

in the state of California, by law--is gambling, card clubs. They've been here since the fortyniners were here, and before. And they'll be here afterwards. There are over 400 card clubs in the state of California. Gardena just happened to be the first one because they took it upstairs to the California Supreme Court. I think I told you the story of how they got there. Because they did not outlaw draw poker. So draw poker became legal because it was not outlawed. Now they have started, since there are great numbers of Orientals that are coming into this area, they have pai-gaw and other Chinese games. And they're trying to outlaw them. So if you want to play one kind of gambling with cards, why, I don't know any reason why you can't play the other types of card games. But Van de Kamp and others have a feeling that there may be, oh, too much control on the part of the management over the thing, and that they are in fact a type of a lottery. Well, I don't think so. But I'm not the judge in that. The judges have not outlawed them. And they've taken it to the courts, and it's

still being appealed. But those are special interests, okay?

Horse racing is legal. The people voted it in 1933, '32, I think it was. I didn't vote it in. I wasn't there. I can't vote it out. But it's there, so we'll make the best of it. If we make the best of it by having people come to the races and wager, we get a percentage out of that. We get about \$140 million a year from horse racing. Well, it's a legitimate business. And there it is, my committee has to do with that. Does that make me a bad man because there's gambling and horse racing? The people wanted it!

Lottery is in my committee. Does that make me a bad man, a "juice man," because of the lottery? I sure as hell haven't gotten anything out of the lottery. I don't want anything out of them. But I do have something to do with it, and I've saved over \$16 million by putting in one bill which required competitive bidding. That figure's been increased, I think, since our last talk here. They gave me some more information.

Liquor was made legal, and that's how I got my first orchestra playing jobs of any consequence. Beer came in in 1933. And liquor is legal in California, and it's very restricted. And we had some scandals back in the days of yore with Arthur Samish and [William G.] Bonelli and so on. And there was a young fellow, an assemblyman at that time, who carried the bills that straightened it out pretty well, a fellow by the name of Casper [W.] Weinberger. [Laughter]

But it's legal. And beer and wine and whiskey and that sort of thing, it's legal. And California has wineries, and we have vineyards, and we have good wine. And when you get wine coming in that has never paid taxes and doesn't have the limitations or the restrictions on it, coming in by black market through France into England, coming in here, and they're selling champagne here in competition with our California champagne at a lower price, you know there is something wrong. And a bill that had to do with that was defeated, claiming that it was not in the interest of the consumers. Well,

huh, it's in the interest of the state of California to be able to have their products bought and sold and not have black marketing come in from those countries where we can't sell them anything. We can't sell them any of our wines. They won't take them. And if they did take them, they'd tax them out, those they did take in.

I'm not trying to justify the committee, nor am I trying to justify the so-called sin things that are in my committee. I am trying to say that I am representing my district, where there are beer-drinkers and wine-drinkers and lottery-players and Gardena gambling and so on and so on and so on. That's what the district is. They're special interests? Okay, they're special interests. So are churches special interests. If you don't think so, listen to Senate Bill 38 of the special session.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] Is there anything you'd like to add for the record to finish this oral history? Anything we've left out?

DILLS: Just one thing that has been summarized, I guess, many, many times: I am so proud that I

can. . . . I'm a country boy in from way out in the sticks. . . . I shouldn't do this.

VASQUEZ: I wish you would. I wish you would take all the time that you want. It's a great interview, and I'd like to finish it in the way that you would like the record to reflect, summing up your career to this point.

DILLS: Well, I think that I've been blessed by a higher power. I've been given an opportunity by the people to serve. I honor their support. I have endeavored in a public service of fifty years or so to keep them in mind and to try to do the job that they've given me the wonderful privilege of performing. I'm going to run again because there are still battles to be fought to prevent the breakdown of what I think is the mainstay of our democracy, and that is our public school system, from kindergarten through the highest ranks of graduate school that they want to go. That was made possible for me by public money and through public schools, and it is a debt that I owe. That I'll try to repay.

[End Tape 8, Side B]